

THE RATIONAL MALE

THE PLAYERS HANDBOOK



ROLLO TOMASSI



THE RATIONAL MALE

VOLUME V - THE PLAYER'S HANDBOOK

ROLLO TOMASSI

CONTENTS

Average Men & Players

The Players Workshops

I. Rules of Engagement

Brand Management

The Lesson of Ziggy Stardust

Game Works

Game does not Occur in a Vacuum

Doing Something

Always Default to Game

Game and Circumstance

Game and Circumstance

Not Just Sex

Male Long Term Security

Changing Your Programming

Game Changers

Game Changes

Game Beyond PUA

Everyone has Game

Build a Better Beta

Building a Better Beta

II. Game Tactics

Demonstrate Higher Value (DHV)

Learn to Read

Assess the Environment

Assess your Target

Assess the Social Conditions

Command Presence

Amused Mastery

Dominance

Amused Dominance

The Mechanics of Kino

The Mechanics of Kino (Kinesthetics)

Casual Kino

Using Kino

Strategic Kino

Breadcrumbs

Conversation

Breadcrumbs - Rewarding Desired Behavior

The Flow

The Process

Embracing the Flow

Be Her Drug Dealer

Shit Tests

No Passing

Reading the Test

Active Testing

Passive Testing

Women enjoy *their* problems with you.

Abundance Mindset

Risk and Reward

Pragmatism

Art of the AMOG

All warfare is based on deception

The Boyfriend Destroyer

The Utility of Beta Males

No Neutral Balance

Relational Equity

Giving Value

Betas at Work

The of Zen Game

Passive Game

Husband = Beta

The Red Flags You Don't Want to See

Direct vs. Indirect Game

Mixing Signals

Game Break - How would you Open?

Peacocking

The Peacock's Tail

Have a Look - Style vs. Peacocking

Peacocking

A note on Perceptions

Game Break: Play to the Meta

Jealousy

Make her jealous

Approach Anxiety

III. Game Dynamics

Sexual Zoning

Know Your Zones

Your workplace is not a sexual zone

The Creep

Over Persistence

Over-Sexualizing

The Slow Creep

How *not* to be a Creep

Strength of Interest

Zero Tolerance

Qualities of The Prince(ss)

Signaling Interest

Unsolicited Kino

Facial focus concentration

Body positioning

Sexual ornamentation

Conversation cues and vocal intonation

Looks - The Importance of the Physical

Muscularity is Sexy

Priorities

Making the Change

Body Language

Leaning In

Leaning Out

The Eyes Have It

Mate Guarding

I Love Mommy

Alpha Tells

Indignation

The Power of No

Crisis of Motive

Introspect

Dancing Monkeys

The Intelligence Paradox
We are who we say we are

IV. Game Maintenance

The Talk

She's Unhaaaaaappy...
Worst Case Scenario
Social Security

Blue Pill Alphas
Dangerous White Knights

Ovulation & Dread
Passive Dread
The Art of the Neg
Negs are *not* insults

Ghosting Friends
The Price of Truth

Deep Conversion
Concepts & Expectations
Deep Conversion
Sexual Mastery
Blue Pill Idealism
The Red Pill Conversion

v. Game, Women, and Social Dynamics

Alpha Widows
What is an Alpha Widow?
FOMO and The Fantasy Ideal
Social Enabling of the Alpha Ideal
Misconceptions
Game Applications

The Cardinal Rule of Mating Strategies

Hypergamy: The Misconceptions
Hypergamy is a Straitjacket
Hypergamy is ONLY defined as "*marrying upward*"
Some women are more Hypergamous than others
Both men and women are Hypergamous
Hypergamy is overemphasized in the Manosphere!
Hypergamy only applies to men with the best
social/provisioning status
It's men who are responsible for Hypergamy
Hypergamy means only 20% of men will *ever* get laid

Hypergamy requires trust on the part of women
Men should stay ignorant of Hypergamy for their own good
Hypergamy just gives women an “out” for bad, evil treatment of men

Women aren’t slaves to Hypergamy
Women are Hypergamous; men are Hypogamous
After marriage, Hypergamy should end
Hypergamy is only about Alpha Fucks
Hypergamy isn’t so important; you’re overstating things

Hypergamy: False Equivalencies
False Equivalencies

Borderline Personality Disorder
The DSM-IV-TR Diagnostic Criteria
True BPDs

Zeroed Out – Men and Suicide
True Powerlessness
Suicide Solution
Loss of Utility
Zeroed Out
Qualifying Value

The Real You
Real change takes time

About the Author
Also by Rollo Tomassi

Dedicated to the memory of Pat Campbell

March 17, 1960 - October 20, 2021

AVERAGE MEN & PLAYERS

“The fulfillment of your sexuality is nothing less than your battle for existence.”

– Pook, 2004

Congratulations. You already have *Game*.

It’s true. Odds are you already have some idea of how to go from single, sexless, and lonely to hooking up, getting a girlfriend, and starting a family with a *Quality Woman*. Because that’s what you’re supposed to do, and **you** *know* how to do it the **right** way. You, my friend, already *have* a Game – the question is, how effective *is* that Game?

You’ve probably been using *Game* for some time now. You have a set of *best practices* in your head that you think will effectively get you a girlfriend. But have you ever asked yourself where you learned these *best practices*? They might even be a good set of rules that have worked for you since middle school.

There are plenty of guys we call *naturals* who seem “lucky with the girls.” He didn’t have to learn Game, right? He just won the genetic lottery, was blessed with a natural charm that women swoon for or has the money and clout that women always want. Surely, he never *learned* Game? Wrong.

Everyone you know has a Game. *Average* men never question how they learned *their* Game. *Average* men trust the *process* and stumble along in their personal lives wondering why *Players* win, and Nice (average) Guys Finish Last. *Average* men occasionally get laid, but they chalk it up to *luck*, fortune, or divine intervention. They’re thankful that fate smiled upon them and see it as proof-positive that *their* Game must have worked to some effect.

Even the *naturals* – the “*hawt guys*” women are drawn to – can’t explain the success of *their* Game. They rarely

have a reason to question it. If it ain't broke, why question it? The *nice* guy and the *natural* both have Game; they just can't tell you how they came to it.

Ask a 10-year-old boy how to go about getting a girlfriend, and you'll see he's ready for your question. Odds are he was taught "how to treat girls respectfully" by his single mother, his female teachers, an 'equal-partner' father, and a massive complex of popular media since he was five years old. He gets bonus points if he manages to insert "*I respect women*" somewhere in his explanation.

We raise our boys like defective girls, who later mature into men who are defective women. They're conditioned to make girls their *mental point of origin* and to trust a *process* that will ensure these girls will eventually approve of them well enough to reproduce with them – if they can measure up to their expectations. That's the *Game* they learn. That's what we call the *Blue Pill*.

Today, average women don't want average men.

Indeed, they are entitled to *elite* men. With every new social media/dating app, the rapidly globalizing sexual marketplace has become more cutthroat and openly mercenary. In many ways, it's a high-stakes game. With every newly minted college degree, with every new career promotion, women's oblivious self-assurance of marrying an "economically attractive" man becomes a rite of passage.

In the era of social media, women's hubris is at epic proportions, with overinflated egos that match their expectations of **High-Value Men**. It's a Darwinian struggle of supply and demand, where average men are invisible men, and *Players* reign supreme.

"Fuck average."
– Mike Rashid

But how does a guy go from ordinary to extraordinary in such chaotic times? Men's mating strategies have always been behavioral and mental contingencies adapted to work around women's mating strategies. Those strategies have ***always*** been adversarial; each sex seeks to solve its reproductive problem in as advantageous a way as possible.

In the past, these disparate strategies had to come to a mutual compromise for both sexes to cooperate in parental investment in children. But for one sex's strategy to prevail, the other's had to be compromised or abandoned. From the time of the Sexual Revolution, men progressively abandoned their strategies (Game) to align themselves with women's strategies in exchange for "*casual*" no-pregnancy sex.

Traditional marriage used to be the formalization of this compromise of strategies, but today we live in the *post-marriage* world of the 21st century. If you were born any time after the Sexual Revolution, you have never known a socio-sexual order that hasn't been predicated on this abandonment/compromise of men's mating strategies.

Women's mating strategies are the predominant social imperatives of today. The days of "Patriarchy" and masculine authority have been over since the late 60s, replaced by *Female Empowerment* and the *Strong Independent Woman* tropes. Any attempt to adapt, circumvent, or discuss the nature of women's mating strategies is met with accusations of "misogyny!" and reproach.

You're a "very bad man" for buying this book.

It confirms that you don't *trust the process* that Girl-World approves of if you want to solve your reproductive problem (i.e., *get laid*). You're an evil man for thinking you

can *know* women's nature and insisting your mating strategy supersedes that of women's. You are in good company, however. Statistics show that women are more attracted to bad men and have more sexual and reproductive success than *average* men. More on that later.

You likely bought this book because you're now confronted with a dilemma.

It's one that the *Master Pickup Artist (PUA)*, ***Mystery***, codified in 2002:

"You will only get what you've gotten if you keep doing what you've done."

You probably already know the definition of insanity is repeatedly doing the same thing while expecting a different outcome each time. Yet, this is precisely how *average* men approach their unlearned, unexamined, *Game*. It's hard to fault them.

We live in a social order whose power is threatened by men understanding their nature, women's nature, and how the two interrelate. Social and political power are intimately linked to the sexual marketplace. We can't have men who don't ***trust the process***

Eventually, they'll find an adaptive measure that gives them an *unfair* advantage over women's mating strategies. They might think their strategies should supersede those of women. They may even believe that the best way to form healthy relationships is for women to compromise or abandon their strategies altogether in favor of men.

You bought this book because, on some level of consciousness, you'd like to think of yourself as being more than *average*. You don't trust the process, or you're at the moment in life where *doing what you've done* is still getting you what you've gotten — nothing.

In fact, it's *never* really *gotten* you much of anything. Now you're questioning the *process* of a **Game** you practice but never realized you were taught by disingenuous influences your whole life. Alcoholics Anonymous calls this a *moment of clarity*. We call it taking the Red Pill.

As of this writing, **Game**, in its formal sense, is into its third decade. The age of the internet and mass media opened men up to new collaborations, access to data, and ideas that gave us new ways to adapt our mating strategies to women's. Since the early 2000s, the term *Game* has become somewhat of an enigma.

It's either the answer to all your problems or the cause of all your problems. It's the mysterious social intelligence that "*cracks the code*" of women and grants you access to all the easter eggs of pussy lesser men have been cruelly denied for so long.

Everyone wants to define Game subjectively. No one understands that it's the last part of the **Holy Trifecta of Masculine Self-Improvement: *Make money, Make muscles, Learn Game*** (*Frame* is the combined balance of all three).

If you subscribe to any flavor of the present-day Manosphere, it's probably some combination of Finance, Fitness, and Fucking. Every Manosphere notable today is a successful "*entrepreneur*," a fitness guru, or a dating coach – and the best hustlers will try to be all three.

Money, Muscles, Game. Of the *Holy Trifecta*, Game is the least understood. This is because a formalized system of Game takes the longest to learn, practice and master. In its rawest sense, Game is a set of social skills we used to develop and mature into. That's why Game is frustrating for the past two generations of men raised on technological buffers that have retarded their developing social skills.

This is also why it's the most neglected of the three. Men who lack the art or the patience to unlearn impractical

social skills and relearn better ones don't see the point of Game. They also don't see the instant results that the ***TL;DR Generation*** demands of its *Gurus*. Your bank account, expensive car, and Rolex are easy metrics for *Financial* success. Your v-taper, six-pack abs, and max-bench press weight are likewise easy measures of *Fitness* success.

But the *receipts* inherent in being Game savvy are more ambiguous. *Fucking* success could be attributable to *Finance* and *Fitness* success. Buy a man a whore, and you get him laid for a night, teach a man Game, and you get him laid for a lifetime. But teaching a man Game takes a lot longer than buying him a \$300 hooker for a night.

As *Mystery* said all those years ago, Game is like learning a martial art – or a *Venusian* art if you like – you don't read a book about karate and instantly become a black belt. It's a process of learning through practice, trial, error, adaptation, and improvisation to go from apprentice to master.

This process is what throws most guys off in the *TL;DR Generation*. They're unused to practice. Modern distractions are far more entertaining than taking a stinging rejection from a woman online, much less *in real life*.

Let's make this clear from the jump; if you don't have the patience to unlearn old social skills, if you don't have the endurance to learn *and* practice new social skills, then don't read the rest of this book. Thanks for buying it, but my first book, *The Rational Male*, is probably better to put you in the proper frame of mind.

To learn Game requires a commitment from you to study and practice. You must be willing to take a lot of shots to the chin until you're skilled enough to see the punch coming. And the first punch will be letting go of your ego in unlearning the bad code your identity was likely programmed with.

In his book, *Mastery*, author *Robert Greene* stated that the hardest part of mastering a new skill isn't access to information or training. Nor is it the 10,000 hours of practice everyone thinks is required to master a new skill – it's letting go of old, ego-invested beliefs about oneself.

The hardest part of mastery is busting yourself down to the rank of apprentice, unlearning old thinking, and deferring to the teaching of someone who's mastered the skills you hope to master yourself. I am asking you to do this before you read any further.

The second reason guys hate Game is that it requires *art*. PUA stands for *Pick Up Artist*. It is not PUS; *Pick Up Scientist*. The Red Pill is the theoretical aspect of Game. I stress in every book I write that *Red Pill* is a praxeology. It's a loose, constantly developing science of intersexual dynamics. Red Pill doesn't concern *right* or *wrong*; *its* concern is what is. Game is applied Red Pill. Game is the practice of Red Pill's theory.

The next problem you – the *Player's Apprentice* – will encounter is that you lack the art needed to play the Game well. Game is an art. Yes, it is the art of seduction, but it's also the art of social calibration, interpreting changing conditions, and applying skills to those situations to reach the desired outcome.

In some sense, Game is strategy, not unlike the art of war. Generals that rely on static conditions and rote memorization of mathematical tactics find themselves defeated by adversaries that fluidly outmaneuver them. Game is an art, not a science. A poor artist blames his tools, not his skill.

This, too, is why *average* men give up on Game or come to hate Game. They thought learning Games was a mathematic equation, not an applied art. On your journey to *Playerhood* you will become an artist, but I can only offer you the tools – you must do the creating.

I compiled this ***Players Handbook*** as a “***Why it works***” book. Understand now, that **this is not a step-by-step guide to Game mastery**. As ever, my purpose is to educate you. I don’t do prescriptions; I do descriptions. This book is chock full of tools, dynamics, and the underlying principles of the *Art of Game*. I offer you the paintbrushes, the easel, the paints, and other stuff you need to be an artist, but you supply the canvas.

That canvas is blank, primed, and ready to accept what **you** put on it. It is not a paint-by-number project where you fill in each preprinted area of the canvas according to the numbered color. You *must* create your Game from scratch. But don’t be intimidated by that blank canvas; you will have some pretty badass tools in your kit.

Game is not therapy. It is not magic, religion or belief. If you picked up this book because you think learning the social skills Game teaches will cure you of your social awkwardness, you’re reading this for the wrong reasons. **Game will not cure you of *Functional Autism* or *Asperger’s Syndrome*.**

I am not a therapist; I am an analyst. I do private (and collective) consulting with men, but I do not do *counseling* or *coaching*. I analyze situations and report my observations to men. If you are presently diagnosed with some form of autism or think you’re on the spectrum, this book may help you understand your difficulties in reading social cues and why women responded to you negatively.

However, it is not a substitute for the clinical therapy you probably need. I can give you an analysis of your situation, but this book is *not* the answer to your problems.

Throughout this book, you will discover 49 Game Maxims.

These principles of Game have been compiled from the likes of *Roissy*, *Roosh*, *Mystery*, myself, and various other Game *luminaries* from over 20 years of writing in the Red Pill and seduction communities. These maxims serve as an

easy reminder of basic Game/Red Pill principles. Though numbered, they are **NOT** (and never will be) intended as a step-by-step guide to Game.

These maxims are not articles of faith, indicative of *philosophy*, nor should they be considered stoic wisdom to comfort you in times of heartbreak and woe. They are presented **only** as pithy reminders of intersexual fundamentals that will hopefully aid you in mastering the practice of Game.

How to read this Book

Average men are everywhere. I've referred to these men as Betas, Blue Pill, and Average Frustrated Chumps (AFCs) in my prior work. Too many people think these terms are insults, but they were meant to refer to types of guys. Yesterday's *Herb* (herbivorous man) or *Soy Boy* is today's *Simp* and *Incel*.

However we define it, these guys are low-value and *average*. They don't get it, or they have no incentive to try to **just get it**. Women statistically deem 80% of men *unattractive*. The mistake is to think that 20% of men **are** attractive to women. No, those men are just not *unattractive*. Maybe more visible than the invisible 80 percenters, but still *average*.

Women only find 4.5% of men **attractive**: attractive enough to initiate a dialogue with them. That 4.5% are the **Players**. Whether they leverage this status or not is irrelevant; they are the *Players*. Their Game may suck, but they are the men women want to **play** with and play **with**. And this is what's at the heart of this book.

You want to be a **Player**, not the **average** guy.

The *average* guy is overweight, un- or underemployed, low-or-no education, rudderless and purposeless in life and love. If this is you, and you're happy in your mediocrity, I wish you all the best. I'm glad you've found happiness. Close this book now and read *The Rational Male*. But, if you want more for yourself, if you aren't content with mediocrity and invisibility, then read on, my young apprentice.

It's time we take back the term **Player** and give it the positive connotation it deserves. Because, by all measures, women *love* a *Player*. They love a man who "*Just Gets It*," a man who *knows* his value to women as a *Player*.

It's time we redefine **Game** as an adaptive set of social skills that facilitate men's mating strategy - not maladaptive exploitation of women's puritanical sensibilities. Women are already *Players*; *they* just can't find another *Player* to play *with*.

Game is for every man, not just the hustler draped over a Lamborghini parked next to his super-yacht. It's also for the guy who showers after he gets home from working on an oil derrick for 32-hours. It's for the guy driving a tractor on his farm in the Midwest. It's for the men in Kenya busting their asses to thrive in the heat.

The guys in Brazil, the men of Korea, and Scandinavia, the Red Pill and Game is for every man or no one. Money, Muscles, and Game is painted over with a jet-set success-porn varnish far too easily today - **Game is for you**.

Single, married, saint or sinner, first-world rich or third-world poor, Game is yours. Anyone telling you otherwise is selling you his lifestyle. This is the lost textbook you and your dating coaches have been missing for decades.

It's time you become a ***Player***.

THE PLAYERS WORKSHOPS

My hope is that this book explains the fundamental mechanics of Game. It's not intended to be an **instruction** manual, but rather the *missing textbook* of Game. Over the years, there's been an exhaustive supply of instructional books, seminars, conferences, and videos from a broad swath of *Dating Coaches*, all specializing in their unique aspect of *pickup*.

Day Game, Night Game, social circle Game, text Game, *Yad Stops* (street Game),... name the niche, and there's probably been a course done for it in the last 20 years.

I've never been a PUA, a *dating coach*, or a *relationship expert*. However, the most common question on my YouTube channel is, "*Rollo, what's the best book to read to learn Game?*" I never really had an answer for them. I usually refer them to the books of my seduction community friends like *Troy Francis*, *James Tusk*, *Nick Krauser*, and *Modern Life Dating*.

The ***Mystery Method*** has been the gold standard for learning Game since 2002. The foundational principles in the *Mystery Method* are still the core of what every Game *instructor* has used for two decades now. But times change, and these principles must adapt to new social conditions and technologies to be relevant and applicable. A Game *manual* must be a "living text."

Red Pill *theory* is best learned by reading, discussion, and debate. Game is learned by reading *and* doing. Game is hands-on learning via observation, experimentation, and improvisation. But there needs to be some aggregate knowledge collected by this act of *doing*.

Game is a craft, and a craft must be practiced to evolve. This craft has no textbook updated for the rigors of the 21st century's sexual marketplace. The metric for Game success

in the early 2000s was the ubiquitous *number-close*, *kiss-close*, or *F-close*.

Today, these successes are irrelevant in a social media-fueled global sexual marketplace. The Game remains the same, but the application is in constant flux. The problem we face today is that we focus exclusively on the highly compartmentalized applications of Game while forgetting the core human principles that make those applications function.

Game is the social skills and *best practices* in navigating intersexual dynamics in a modern sexual marketplace. While the conditions of that marketplace constantly change, the human-machine does not. As such, a base codex for Game must be established. That codex must fluidly address an empirical understanding of men and women's natures and intersexual dynamics.

We need a modern Game textbook based on empirical data, not emotional hopefulness. We need a reference manual for all dating coaches, PUAs, relationship experts, and anyone else with a keen interest in these dynamics. We need a *Players Handbook* to guide the practice of *all* Game. That's what I've endeavored to do here, but it's incomplete without your input.

The five sections of this book coincide with *The Players Workshop* series of videos and courses offered by *The Rational Male*®. This book is the coursework for these five courses.

Each course section is provided as instruction, Q&A, and critical debate on all principles in this book. Look for these *Players Workshop* classes, videos, and online discussions on [**therationalmale.com**](http://therationalmale.com)

Why do my eyes hurt?

You've never used them before.

PART I

RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

BRAND MANAGEMENT

RUNNING GAME IS JUST A COPE MAN!

"Only manipulative losers buy into that dating coach PUA stuff.

Stop chasing women. Chase excellence, live your best life, go your own way, and the girls will come to you."

Welcome to the *Churn*.

Most people don't realize it, but they're caught up in a *Churn*. I didn't make up that term. A *Churn* is marketing terminology for anything that keeps you in a constant cycle of emotional highs followed by disappointing lows. It's reward *and* punishment. Joys that give you hope to stick with the program followed by lows that are just tolerable enough to keep you in a *Churn*. That *Churn* is the most straightforward form of marketing, made all the easier in the age of social media.

Churns are very enjoyable for humans - even the ones that punish us. If you binge-watch a series on *Netflix*, you've been in a *Churn*. If you've transitioned your quest for love from *Match.com* to Tinder, you're in a *Churn*. If you get excited when you see the '*typing*' ellipses dots in your favorite instant messaging app, you're in a *Churn*. Big Tech companies hire teams of psychologists to make their apps more *engaging* to better compete in *Churn* marketing.

A *Churn* is anything that fits the marketing of *Managed Dissatisfaction*. It's not quite *profiteering* because the marketer doesn't directly create the demand, but it is a pre-established discontent that's never entirely resolved. And there is no more significant market for *Managed Discontent* than online dating. Since 2000, online dating has become the *only* way people meet up, hook up or fall in love. The risk of a face-to-face rejection and the thrill of

lust, at first sight, is displaced by swiping left or swiping right today.

“If you’re not a brand, you’re a commodity.”
– Robert Kiyosaki

IRL, ***in real life***, “dating” used to be a test of social skills. You’d enter the sparring ring, get your ass handed to you more often than not, but you’d be wiser for the next go in the ring. Dating in the 20th century was more about social skills than social perception. Looks and status were qualifying factors, but you had to be able to think on your feet to fully leverage the looks and status you had (or didn’t have). Social intelligence was and still is a massive advantage in the sexual marketplace.

Dating in the 21st century is all *Brand Management*.

Everything in the 21st century is managing the *brand of you*, but nowhere is this need for personal PR more apparent than in the *Churn* of online dating. And ironically, to be an effective *brand manager* requires the social intelligence we used to learn through IRL interactions. Today, *ain’t nobody got time for that*. Since the rise of social media, our global online culture has been defined by two things; imagery and immediacy.

Our online lives are ones of constant distraction, multitasking, and sorting out the noise from what’s worth our shorter and shorter attention spans. For the TL;DR (*too long; didn’t read*), generation dating is just one more arena vying for our headspace. The days of introspection and developing relationships have been replaced with instant, curated imagery, all intended to *get to the point* of selling our sexual market *brand* in the best picture before the swipe. Image and perception are king.

Not everyone is adept at *public relations* and *brand management*. Old order thinkers clinging to 20th-century ideals of dating are the first casualties in this sexual marketplace. This paradigm shift has resulted in people learning to become pathological liars about their *brand's* positioning – not unlike commercial brands. Rounding off your height or weight, *press* shots of unowned luxuries in exotic locales on Instagram, and women studying modeling photography to maximize views, likes, and engagement all contribute to our *brand's* character that becomes **us**.

Over time, online dating services and apps have adapted to our shortening attention spans. The 20th-century get-to-know-you appeal of E-Harmony, Match, and OkCupid have been replaced with 21st-century image-focused, volume-driven swipe-based apps like Tinder, Bumble, and Hinge. *Ain't nobody got time for* anything but the initial perception. Even sites like *Seeking Arrangements* and *Sugaring* are cumbersome by comparison. Success in the online dating business means managing customer dissatisfaction.

The thrill of swiping left or right, or the perception of choice-overload for women, isn't just about the immediate dopamine hit. Like gambling addiction, numerous downstream effects influence a society across generations. In other words, we believe our *branding is* who we are, and we pass it on to others.

In turn, those brands are all the products of how bigger Players market to us. The inherent problem with *managed dissatisfaction* is that anyone with a better experience is the new winner – as long as they can afford it. Once you've *found your soulmate*, the *Churn* ends. The dopamine thrill of the hunt is over, the choice paradox for women (theoretically) ceases, and the ego-affirmation of that high-engagement imagery comes to an end. At least it's supposed to now that we've completed the quest.

The goal in using the app was to find fulfillment in a relationship. The problem then is the exhilaration of *finding love* pales compared to the up and down thrills of the *Churn*. By design, the *Churn* is more engaging than an actual relationship. So much so that we feel bad for wanting to get back to it. Like any good video game, we want some replay-ability.

This is the way we do dating in this century. It's brand management in the same way your LinkedIn profile is brand management for your career. It's just a different context with a different set of criteria. A 12-year-old girl with a TikTok account isn't looking for a husband, but she *is* managing a brand. **Instagram Boyfriends** getting criticized for their inability to take the perfect *viral* swimsuit shot of their girlfriend on the beach don't realize they're just *branding* assistants for her.

The truly successful, genuinely viral players in this game understand the *management* aspect of their branding. Most successful players are just natural narcissists. Self-absorbed egoism carries them, but they have no fundamental understanding of why what they're doing works. More rarely, there are the handful of elite Players who see the code in this 21st-century Matrix and exploit it to their best advantage. The top percentage earning women on OnlyFans is an example of this elite player. This Machiavellian spirit is perfectly acceptable for women. It's even encouraged as a form of empowerment. Men who understand and leverage the *algorithm* are mercenaries, misogynists, or manipulators. They're called **Players**.

It's a game we're all playing by force or by choice, but we're not supposed to *like* playing. Online dating and *brand management* apps prove that we're liars. We *love* playing. Like the gambling addicts the Big Tech psychologists know we are, we love the dopamine hit of a new chance after a big bet. We love the cliff-hanger episodes on the *viral* series we binge-watch on Netflix. It

keeps us in the game, but *don't hate the player, hate the game*.

Successfully pairing people in healthy long-term relationships is a flawed business model for online dating and the *personal branding* we spend so much time cultivating and fine-tuning. It ends the profitability of the *Churn*. Keeping people *permanently* single is an ideal but ultimately untenable state.

As an elite Player, you have to understand the realities of the Game you're playing and the psychology of other players. More importantly, accept that your *brand of you* is competing with countless other brands for the same attention space in all the noise and distractions. Developing a relationship or even getting casual sex required social intelligence and learned attention to detail in the past. Even a same night lay required an intellectual ability to read a woman's cues correctly.

Dating in the 21st century is at a breakneck speed. The metrics that used to mean something in the 20th century are obsolete in the 21st. Sourcing, sorting, managing, and curating sexual or relationship prospects are part of *Brand Management*. Followers, likes, views, engagement, and follow back are data sets to inform what *brand identity* works for you and what doesn't. While the fundamental natures of men and women remain constant, the methodology of Game has to evolve with times.

Before you can learn Game, before you can be a Player, you must accept and embrace the nature of the game. Today that game is defined by immediacy, urgency, FOMO (fear of missing out), imagery, and perception that can change in 24 hours. **If you hope to be good at Game, you must embrace the *Churn*.** That doesn't mean finding a lasting healthy relationship is impossible. On the contrary, mastering the *Churn* will help you mold a good relationship in the long term.

Ignorant Red Pill critics don't understand that guys learning Game aren't just learning a couple of lines to get laid. They're doing complete overhauls of their psychology, beliefs, mindsets, behaviors, etc. Learning Game isn't just something you try out for a few months and go all-in on, or give up and become an anti-Game *Doomer*. Red Pill awareness and Game savvy are incomplete without the other, but mastering them is a long-term project, not a certification course.

"Say this one magic line, and in a weekend you'll go from Simp to Pimp" is the same *Churn* marketing based on the same *managed dissatisfaction* as any online dating app. Learning Game is a long-term project. Depending on how hard-case a newbie you are, you could spend the first year just fixing up your fundamental social interactions, let alone interacting with women.

Elite *Players* don't hit their prime until their 2nd or 3rd year Gaming and cultivating their persona. Even then, you'll be breaking through plateaus and trying new stuff out to streamline your style. And then some advanced guys get stuck on a plateau where they're so attached to the external stuff that they never start towards internalizing Game which is an entirely new journey that they didn't even realize they'd have to go on.

It would help if you understood this progression before moving into a new phase you didn't think was part of Game. Even the best Game gurus, dating coaches, and relationship experts selling their wares in the click-funnel, hustle economy of today only understand individual aspects of how Game progresses on the whole.

They focus on a *style* of Game, or they become domain-dependent on environments and circumstances ideal for making *their* Game work for you. Then you have the lifestyle-authentic-masculinity coaches who have no practical experience in Game selling the idea that you must overhaul your psyche, beliefs, mindsets, behaviors, etc.,

before you learn the social skills of Game needed to institute those changes. Neither approach sees nor appreciates the *journey* of the whole progression.

You are already a ***Brand of Me***.

You're already hip-deep in promoting yourself in the global sexual marketplace *Churn*. You've just never had it exposed to you. You might wonder why specific pictures of yourself get more likes than others or why a tweak to your Tinder profile got you a swipe, but what you lack is an education in brand management and public relations. We all like to think we're exceptional individuals, unique in our ways. We don't like the thought of commodifying our personalities into brands or products. It's dehumanizing enough to put images of ourselves into a marketplace where 80% of men are deemed "*unattractive*," and only 4.5% will have a woman initiate contact.

Average men invest their *specialness* into their attractiveness, so rejection hurts, even when that rejection is blind indifference to that specialness on Tinder. We're idealists by nature, but the 21st-century sexual marketplace demands we become pragmatists or go extinct. And pragmatically, no one will know or care how *special* you are until you accept your *branding* and learn how to dominate in managing it. So throw away all your romantic ideals, and let's get down to the *business* of you.

The Lesson of Ziggy Stardust

Now, all that said, it's time to remember the lesson of *Ziggy Stardust*. In 1972 *David Bowie* put out his best album, *The Rise and Fall of Ziggy Stardust and the Spiders from Mars*. In making one of the greatest concept albums of all time, Bowie also created an alter-ego for himself that was Ziggy Stardust. In a 2016 interview, Bowie explained Ziggy to *Rolling Stone* magazine:

"What I did with my Ziggy Stardust was package a totally credible, plastic rock & roll singer - much better than the Monkees could ever fabricate. I mean, my plastic rock & roller was much more plastic than anybody's. And that was what was needed at the time."

The character of Ziggy became an omnisexual alien rock star, sent to earth as a messenger. The music was epic, the stage show was apocalyptic, and the persona of Ziggy was eminently believable. Fans were convinced Bowie and the band were aliens. By the time the tour kicked off, the response was almost cult-like.

"At first, I just assumed that character onstage. Then everybody started to treat me as they treated Ziggy: as though I were the Next Big Thing, as though I moved masses of people. I became convinced I was a messiah. Very scary. I woke up fairly quickly."

Bowie explained he had to kill off the persona of Ziggy because *he* was taking over *his* personality. His fans wanted Ziggy, not David Bowie. He reveled in his character for a while, but what Bowie had done is what countless people do online every day - they revel in the imagery of the persona they craft for their fans.

Fortunately, David Bowie was insightful enough to realize what was happening to him. He killed Ziggy before he became Ziggy. His fans were pissed off by his refusal to revisit the character, but they eventually got over it. The *authentic* personality of David Bowie was more durable and much more interesting than Ziggy ever could be. This story teaches a valuable lesson in the social media age; ***Don't let the "brand of you" become you.***

Never meet your heroes is a proverb for a reason. Their characters *are* who **they** are. If you've ever met a famous politician, religious figure, athlete, or musician, odds are they were **in character** when you shook hands. After a while, **they** became the persona they had to be to get famous. It's one of the reasons it's refreshing to find someone we admire is actually down-to-earth and genuinely relaxed despite the character they portray. There's a separation of *brand* and *person*.

The danger in the online world is that our *brands* incrementally become our *authentic* personas. Our brands are the Ziggy takes over our *true selves*. Today, I constantly see people in character for their brand. Nothing comes out of their mouths that isn't a *brand-managed* message. Most don't even realize they're talking on-brand and in-character. For guys hustling a brand online, I expect this now.

But, when it comes to the curated personas of people selling themselves in the global sexual marketplace, it's easy to be seduced by the *brand persona* that took over the actual person. Pragmatic, almost ruthless, brand management is vital to good Game, but be like Bowie – know when Ziggy is getting the upper hand.

You will inevitably become someone new in the process of learning Game and being Red Pill aware. But always keep in mind that the *brand persona* needed to be a good Player can become *you*.

Ziggy is what your followers, fans, and the girls on Instagram expect of you. Just know, you may have to kill Ziggy at some point to allow the more durable, interesting *you* to thrive in the long term.

GAME WORKS

GAME, FOR LACK OF A BETTER WORD, IS GOOD. GAME IS RIGHT.
GAME WORKS.

Listening to myself in an old interview, I remembered having an idea during the conversation. Towards the middle of it, I thought about the benefits of what we now call **Game**. It made me consider how Game has progressed to what it is today. In *The Rational Male*, I wrote the *Evolution of Game* chapter. You'll have to read it in the first book, but I added this to give you a better grasp of where *Game* came from and just what it is now.

There's been a lot of refinement of what Game is (or should be) over the years, but I've always considered Game an abstract term for a much more significant concept. Game is applied social skills, which are sorely lacking in men today.

Critics portray "*those red pill game guys*" as throwbacks to the Pickup Artist (PUA) communities of the early 2000s. This is a shortsighted evaluation. Facing Red Pill truths is uncomfortable. I understand the need to dismiss the application of those truths casually. Accepting Red Pill awareness requires a depth of character or an experience traumatic enough to shake you from beliefs that make up your personality. Who you are is the product of those beliefs. It requires effort to unlearn old-order thinking, and honestly, most guys are too lazy to consider Red Pill truths in a world of reaffirming distractions.

This lethargy prevents them from understanding that Game and Red Pill awareness has matured *far* beyond the PUA routines and techniques of the early 2000s. *Neil Strauss* published his book, ***The Game***, in 2005. It's been a long time since *Mystery* was wearing top hats, elevator boots and painting his fingernails black. Those caricatures are easy to laugh at, but since then, the social observations

and practices developed by early Game aficionados fed into what we eventually came to understand as Red Pill **awareness** today.

Red Pill is the theory. **Game is the practice**. Game was the in-field test experimentation. Red Pill was the theory that evolved from the data generated by those experiments. Each informs the other. What is now the Red Pill praxeology is an aggregate of all this data.

“The body of infield evidence collected by 15 years of PUA is far more reliable and valid than anything social science has ever produced on seduction.”

— Nick Krauser

Game was a revolution in intersexual dynamics. For the first time in history, men could compare notes about seduction and openly discuss the natures of women and men via an ever-increasing, easily accessible online database. Even well-meaning Red Pill men still ridicule the PUAs of the past, but if you’ve embraced Red Pill awareness today, you have these PUA pioneers to thank for it. They risked rejection, ridicule, and moral condemnation in the practice and experimenting that laid the foundation for contemporary Red Pill awareness.

Imagine if all men had to build on was the studies and controlled experiments of feminized social science academia. Imagine what Red Pill awareness would be if not for the guys in the field doing ‘*experiments*.’ Imagine what marriage counselors and ‘*relationship experts*’ would (and still do) advise men to change their lives based solely on gynocentric social science. Only the PUAs had the unfettered freedom to perform in-field experiments and relate their collected results with other men.

These were experiments that social science has always been limited by for ethical considerations or feminine social

conventions. MGTOW (*Men Going Their Own Way*), MRAs (*Men's Rights Activists*), neo-masculine TradCons (*Traditional Conservatives*), and even the self-loathing Black Pill "*Doomers*" communities of today all owe a debt of gratitude to the PUAs they ridicule and despise.

Game does not Occur in a Vacuum

Comment threads on various “**Pill**” social media tend to devolve into “*Looks are all that matters, so why bother learning Game?*” echo chambers. It progresses from *go-your-own-way* defeatism, to resolving to live in the gym (“*Looksmaxxing*”, *GymCels*) until you can organically inspire female arousal. Then it moves to appeals to magical positivity and *inner* confidence.

While I’ve consistently recognized the apparent truth that **Looks** are a prime requisite for arousal (and attraction), I also see the effort to discredit Game and Red Pill awareness by absolutism, binary extremes, and outright absurdities that only serve as a catharsis for young men who already feel powerless in the sexual marketplace.

For anyone thinking Game and Red Pill awareness is valueless or superfluous in the face of women’s drive for physical arousal, I suggest you read blogger **Advocatus Diaboli**’s treatise on ***how to pragmatically use escorts*** (either that, or relocate to the state of *Nevada* where prostitution is legal).

I hold no disapproval of men who feel this is the best way to satisfy their need for sex. It may indeed be your best (or only) option in our current social conditions. There is no such thing as an *involuntary* celibate in the 21st century. If you want to get laid, you can get laid.

For everyone else, I think it’s vitally important to learn and consider the benefits of Game, both in an intersexual and interpersonal context. If you call yourself “*red-pilled*” (another useful-but-abstract term), Game has benefitted you already. Game’s early trials and errors led to the Red Pill principles we now take for granted.

- If you have even a cursory grasp of how women's evolution, biology, and menstrual cycle influences ovulatory shift behaviors in mate preferences – and you've altered your perception of women – Game has benefitted you.
- If you understand the basics of hypergamy and the mating strategies women use to optimize their mate selection and then change your tact, Game has benefitted you.
- If you've internalized the core psychological principles underlying women's perceptions of **Amused Mastery, Command Presence, Agree & Amplify, Cocky & Funny, Social Proof, Preselection, Dread**, and even **Chick Crack** – whether you've applied them or not – Game has expanded your consciousness of women's behaviors and their motivators.
- If you've had the insight to question your Blue Pill social conditioning, the reasons for your predispositions towards Savior Schemes, feminine identifying, why an LJBF (*Let's Just Be Friends*) is a rejection, why self-defeating Beta Game comes naturally to men, or why SMV (*Sexual Market Value*) accrues and decays throughout a lifetime, Game and the Red Pill have benefitted you.
- If you've used or modified any of these principles to better your marriage, your dealings with co-workers, your daughter, mother, or even your best friend's domineering wife, you've benefitted from Game.
- If you've saved or bettered another man's life, or improved his intergender relationships, via Red Pill awareness, you've both benefitted from Game.

I could go on, but if you believe that women's physical arousal impulses trump any value that Game or Red Pill awareness has, then you're wasting your time reading what I have to offer here. You'd be better served by focusing all your attention on lifting in the gym and shifting your career goals toward a physically demanding job that keeps you at your physical best.

Ironically, prioritizing men getting in shape is also an aspect of Game. Even if your belief is "*Looks are everything*," but yet your understanding of this comes as a result of your Red Pill awareness of the *Alpha Fucks* side of hypergamy; guess what? Game has *still* benefitted you.

Just a familiarity with Game concepts, whether you accept them or not, still influences your perception of women and the motivations behind their behaviors. Red Pill awareness challenges female-correct thinking. Why do you think the mass dissemination of Red Pill awareness is so threatening to our present-day Gynocentric social order?

Doing Something

What is the manosphere actually “doing?” This is the first critique of guys who are “*solution seekers*.” They want a one-size-fits-all 7 step program that will get them laid, ensure a loving wife, a mother of their kids, and halts the moral degeneracy destroying western culture today.

The Red Pill and Game is big on theory and answers but short on prescriptions. Average men want average solutions, but the Red Pill is a toolbox, not an instruction manual.

Game is the practice; Red Pill is the theory. Each is incomplete without one informing the other. There are hundreds of gurus on the internet today, each with rags to riches come-up stories, ready to sell you the secret method they used to be *successful*. But when it comes to Game, it’s DIY, do-it-yourself. You get to build your success program, one designed specifically for you, by you.

Anyone telling you they have easy answers is either religious or selling you something – usually both. The Red Pill praxeology and Game practice are necessarily complex. There is no elevator pitch for the Red Pill. A complete understanding of intersexual dynamics encompasses evolutionary psychology, evolutionary biology, behaviorism, sociology, endocrinology, anthropology, neuroscience, memetics, theology, and political science.

Red Pill awareness and putting it into practice isn’t something a ‘dating coach’ on YouTube can teach you. It’s a learning process, like majoring in intersexual dynamics in college. Furthermore, you must be willing to get your hands dirty experimenting in the field. Doing something practical is part of the learning.

I’m of a “bottom-up” or an inside-out mind when it comes to enacting Red Pill “change.” The *Manosphere* **is**

raising awareness. This needs time (maybe even a generation) to mature into personal consciousness and then popular consciousness. It's difficult to quantify the "*results*" of the Manosphere, Red Pill awareness, and Game because its effects are individual and subjective at this stage.

There isn't a day that goes by that I don't receive an email, a comment, or a tweet about how my books or what I've written on the blog has changed (or saved) a man's life. That's not a flex.

Rather, it illustrates a point – the Red Pill and Game *is* doing something. It's changing minds and lives. It's not rallying men in the streets and waving banners. It's not affecting legal or social policy (yet), but it makes men aware of their condition and changes their beliefs. Red Pill awareness, often despite the *Manosphere*, is becoming unignorable.

Red Pill awareness is a new social consciousness of men and women's natures. People resist the conclusions that Red Pill questions imply because they challenge cherished beliefs about how men and women are supposed to interact. Game is the practice of Red Pill awareness, but it's something more than just a set of techniques, behaviors, and scripts guys use to get laid.

Game teaches social skills.

These are the interpersonal skills that generations of young men increasingly lack in the 21st century. *Game* is a euphemism we apply to social skills prior generations had to learn by observing **and doing**. The trial and error process is largely absent in the age of social media. Now we have *buffers* against rejection and it's false insurances against defeat and failure.

The “everyone is special” participation trophy generation has rapidly become the TL;DR generation – too long; didn’t read. In becoming so, they’ve lost the infield and *lived* experience of taking the punch in the face necessary to teach socialization. We’ve become a society of “winners” who didn’t have to do anything to “feel special” and never learned the lessons by growing stronger through defeat.

As a result, young men become lost. They’re stunted and unable to understand how to interact with men *as men*, much less how to interact with women at all. If you believe you suffer from (or we’re diagnosed with) Autism, Asperger’s Syndrome, or some other clinical disorder that makes you socially awkward, understand this right now – **Game isn’t going to cure you.** Game is not therapy. There’s no magic involved.

That said, there are many applications of Game you can use in other aspects of your life besides the intersexual ones. Most guys who become “*Red Pilled*” and successfully employ their own *Game* eventually come to find it’s helpful in other areas of their lives. The social skills Game teaches you will benefit your relations with family, friends, school, sports, coworkers, etc.

“Learn the rules like a pro so that you can break them like an artist.”

– Pablo Picasso

In all likelihood, there’s a hell of a lot of hard work you’ll need to invest in to start unlearning failed ideas and start practicing skills that will make you more than you are today. I won’t lie to you; **you’re probably at a deficit right now.** You’re likely playing catch-up to social skills you didn’t learn earlier in life – or worse, you’ve been

handicapped by beliefs or circumstances that retarded your social intelligence.

I'll be upfront about it; this book won't magically cure your condition. But understanding your situation is the first step to moving in the right direction. PUA stands for *Pick Up Artist*. "Art" is the last word in that acronym for a reason – Game is an art, not a science.

You have to be the artist. You have to become skilled at adaptation and improvisation using the Red Pill and Game tools in your toolkit. Some of those tools will turn into your staples, others you'll rarely use at all. But it's up to **you** to build something. Your circumstances are unique to you. This is why I don't do prescriptions on *The Rational Male*. **My** past performance is in no way indicative of **your** future success.

If you're a white belt in Game right now, don't expect to be a black belt after you finish this book. You'll need to put the tools into practice. Great artists and musicians don't become masters because of natural talent or reading about them; they made themselves great through training.

That said, after reading this book, you will have new tools and a better understanding of how to practice Game and develop interpersonal skills that will help you incrementally *build* a life of your choosing. What that life looks like is up to you.

ALWAYS DEFAULT TO GAME

There's an old problem with Game. It's an old confusion over when to "*run*" Game on a woman and when not to. When is it *appropriate* to use Game? This concern used to be debated in seduction forums. Occasionally it'll come up with guys new to the Red Pill, usually in the process of disconnecting from their Blue Pill ideals. They want to know when it's *appropriate* to use their new Game superpowers for **good**.

So, we'll revisit the fundamentals. The idea guys were talking about then was how Game was turned on or off as situations dictated. Guys would come up with hypotheticals or real situations in which they were unsure if *using* Game was appropriate or *suitable*. Sometimes these were ethical dilemmas, but mostly it was just a want for avoiding bad outcomes. These are a few of the more common ones:

- Should I use Game on the woman at the office?
- Should I use Game on the fat chick I honestly have no interest in?
- I find myself using Game techniques on my overbearing Mother, and it works!
- Should I feel bad?
- When I apply Game/Red Pill aware practices in other areas of my life, I find I'm better able to enjoy the results I want but isn't this manipulative?

The assumption in all of these is that Game is an **act** and separate from that individual's personality or "who he *really* is." While I may advise against actively "gaming" women in your workplace, the **Frame** you establish by

applying Red Pill awareness practices (i.e., Game) will be invaluable to you in this respect.

Every time I've dealt with this question, the guy asking about his situation is still thinking in Blue Pill terms but has accepted the realities of Red Pill awareness. He may have even ***killed this inner Beta*** for the better part, but the process of changing his Blue Pill programming, to say nothing about his *mental point of origin*, is a time-consuming one. The answer is a simple one: **Always default to Game.**

Law 14

Pose as a Friend, Work as a Spy

"Knowing about your rival is critical. Use spies to gather valuable information that will keep you a step ahead. Better still: Play the spy yourself. In polite social encounters, learn to probe. Ask indirect questions to get people to reveal their weaknesses and intentions. There is no occasion that is not an opportunity for artful spying."

– The 48 Laws of Power, Robert Greene

This law illustrates how Game is applicable even in situations with no real intimate interests in a woman. In this instance, *artful spying* takes ***learning to read*** a particular woman. A branch of Game taught this: Guys new to Game should apply it with "less than optimal" (fat) women to perfect the practice. In other words, always default to Game. It's a relatively low investment way to evaluate proof-of-concept and build on it.

Now, as much as I'd like guys to be able to go from zero to hero with Game, you must be pragmatic. You've still got to consider the complications and attachments that **will** result from your Game actions. Girls who are unaccustomed to a charming guy will inevitably read more

interest into your Game than women who get a lot of attention from men.

Not just this, you also need to be at least peripherally aware of how your *Frame Control*, *Command Presence*, *Amused Mastery*, etc., will impact non-intimate women's disposition and attachment to you. Average men rarely leave the mental imprint on women that a Red Pill-aware man does, to say nothing of a more Alpha man.

Case Study: In my old line of work (liquor and gaming), there were times when I was working a promo with my girls or meeting women I'd never met before. I had to make a mental effort to be self-conscious about how I interacted with them. It was the reverse of constantly making an effort to stay in *Frame* to effect Game.

Red Pill awareness is part of me now. It's become my nature and personality. I default to Game. It's not even Game to me anymore; it's just who I am – mainly when I'm “**on**” and I need to interact in a social context. **I am the Game.** It flows so naturally for me I sometimes have to make an effort to dial it back when I see indicators of interest, or I get persistent Kino from the women working for me.

At some point, Game must cease to be an *act* and start to become *who* you are.

Your *mental point of origin* is your internalized understanding of how you fit into your *Frame*. Suppose *Frame* is the dominant narrative of your relationship (not limited to just romantic relations). In that case, your *mental point of origin* is the importance and priority you give to the people and ideas involved in that relationship. It is the first thought you have when considering any relationship variable. It's often so ingrained in us that it becomes an autonomous mental process.

The process of learning Game leads to internalizing it to the point where it is no longer “roleplaying.” What was an act, what was your learned response to interacting with

women (and people), becomes your new *natural* response. Game gurus will call this “*Inner Game*,” but it needs to be more than that. You have to become the Game at some point, or it will always seem self-conscious acting to you.

While it is vital for a man to internalize fundamental truths about the nature of women (hypergamy, solipsism, Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks, love based on opportunism, etc.), these fundamentals need to become an ambient condition for you in your relationships. This understanding needs to become an internalized part of your interactions with women.

Inexperienced Blue Pill men think that being good at Game requires some endless ability to micromanage every aspect of their interactions. And not just with the women they become intimate with, but also women they work with, their mothers, sisters, or daughters. Men initially reject Game’s practice (not necessarily the concept), thinking they’ll need to *keep up the act* indefinitely. They believe they’ll have to account for every variable a woman may or may not be subjecting him to and have some *if-then* response prepared by rote memorization.

When you think of Game as some act, you put on or some cognitive fencing match – thrust, parry, riposte – between you and a woman, it’s easy to believe it’s just too exhausting. That’s when one of two things usually happens; Game-awareness either sinks in and becomes part of his personality, or he relaxes and abandons what he’s learned of Game.

Neo: *So what’re you trying to tell me that I can dodge bullets?*

Morpheus: *No, Neo, what I’m trying to tell you is that when you’re ready, you won’t have to.*

When you think of Game as some act you put on, it becomes a kind of cognitive fencing match – thrust, parry, riposte – between you and a woman. After a while, even when you’re successful, it’s easy to believe it’s just too exhausting. That’s when one of two things usually happen. Game-awareness either sinks in and becomes part of your personality, or you relax and abandon what you’ve learned of Game. Guys get lazy.

If Game is an act, average men will invariably want to find some *special* girl with which they can drop the show. Every man who’s ever backslid from being successful with women to a comfortable Beta existence after they got married did so because they never internalized Red Pill awareness and Game savvy.

It was a helpful mask they had to wear just long enough to get their *dream girl*. Only after they’ve committed to her do they realize that getting comfortable enough to be their *authentic selves* and letting the mask drop is a betrayal of that woman’s genuine desire. That’s how most of the fat, miserable, domestic couples you know got started.

That’s the warning. The good news is once this awareness is internalized and becomes a part of your personality, there is no need for vigilance, only attention. You develop a subconscious understanding of the order of things from a Red Pill perspective. This doesn’t mean I suspect the female bank teller I’m depositing with is ready to rob me blind the moment I turn to walk out the door.

Neil Strauss hinted at “social robots” in *The Game*. He worried that guys who perfected their *game* long enough would become nothing but Game all the time. They’d be unable to make real emotional connections because the *act* of Game would prevent them. I argue just the opposite. The real danger inherent in Game and Red Pill awareness is a man using it to fulfill his former Blue Pill idealisms, which do require constant effort.

"We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence then is not an act, but a habit."

That quote wasn't *Aristotle*, by the way. However, it resonates with what he believed. Practice doesn't make perfect; practice makes it possible. After a time, we cease to be a novice and become proficient at things. A few of us master them, but we are authentically different from when we began. Our newly honed instincts, our freshly developed reflexes become the authentic **us**.

A healthy Red Pill awareness requires a man's reassessment and re-creation of himself, which means he abandons his former Blue Pill *self*. It seems a daunting task when you first come to terms with it. Ultimately your awareness becomes an internalized part of who you are.

You can allow that to consume you with paranoia rooted in your former Blue Pill frame, or you can learn to create hope in a new system, one that you not only have more control over but one that requires you to assume that control. So, ***Always Default to Game***.

With that comes a practiced learning and internalization process of Red Pill awareness. You must *become* the Game. I know that sounds like fortune cookie Zen, but once your personality becomes one that defaults to Game, you'll discover that Game is not just for picking up women. I've personally used Red Pill awareness and Game practices to close business deals, convince people with money to go with my creative ideas, and even get out of a traffic ticket.

- That said, the questions you should ask yourself now are:
- Do I hesitate to use Game in different situations? If so, why?
- Do I think Game is only applicable in intimate interactions?

- Am I hesitant to use Game because of ethical or Blue Pill considerations?
- Could I ever apply Game and Red Pill-aware ideas to women below my SMV?
- Is it advisable to “practice” Game with women I have no personal interest in?

GAME AND CIRCUMSTANCE

"Don't be mad. It's not our fault you were born without the sport fucking gene, come on."

I once took a backpacking trip through the Great Smokey Mountains in Tennessee and North Carolina. I wanted to unplug, go off the grid and get back into the real face-to-face world. It was only for ten days, but it was well worth burning ten days of vacation. It was an educational experience meeting people. Back then, most of them had very little online presence beyond using Twitter or FaceBook occasionally. I didn't have cell service for most of the hike.

The people I met along the way were "salt of the earth" people. Some were hikers; others lived and worked in the surrounding communities. It was good to reaffirm my ability to survive on my own and realize that there's a whole world of men out there who *live well*, far beyond the influence of "men" who've never mowed their lawns, much less lived by their wit in the country — Guys who build muscle by working outdoors instead of a gym.

I met beautiful women who worked in small diners you'll never hear of. For dinner some nights, I fished rivers and streams and saw fireflies for the first time (Hey, I grew up in southern California, it was a novelty).

At some point, I think Men *need* to get back to their primal natures; they need to embrace it fearlessly. The Buffers of technology insulate us far too much. Even the more belligerent rednecks I encountered still preferred to text their girlfriends.

I guess what I came to realize was that we tend to view what we 'know' about men and women from the experiences we have reported to us from all over the world on blogs, YouTube, social media, the *manosphere* - yes, I

still endorse the purpose of its unwritten mission – however, this trip reaffirmed that there’s no substitute for *natural* interaction.

Game will work equally well with the cute blonde serving coffee in a rural diner as it would with the club girl in NYC. Both behave according to the same fundamentals we’ve sorted out in the ‘*sphere* for decades, but we imagine an archetype of the typical club girl for our examples. *Daisy Duke* is still subject to Hypergamy; she just applies it differently.

In my old day to day life, I dealt with a lot of rich men. Every patron or boss, every general manager I’ve dealt with for the past 20 odd years, has been a millionaire. The primary owner of one of my liquor brands was that many times over. None of the “business friends” I’d play golf with ever weeded their lawns or installed a radiator.

When I was on the trail, I thought about how ridiculous it would be to see a guy like that or some PUA guru having to dig his own toilet and take a dump in the woods or hoist his pack in a tree, so the damn bears don’t eat the only food he’s got for the next three days. These guys are insulated. I want to run, fight, and fuck, as well as deal with the ‘civilized’ things I do. Imagine an ultra-rich success-porn playboy wringing the sweat and filth out of his clothes in a stream somewhere. Now, that’s some funny shit.

Game and Circumstance

This experience wasn't just grounding for me; it taught me that what I experience daily isn't what a majority of men experience. My past, my *notch* count, my 25-year marriage, and what I do professionally set me apart in a way that I sometimes don't appreciate or consider when I'm advising men. It's also very humbling when I receive emails or comments from men living in countries I've only seen in pictures who nevertheless share a common male experience that reinforces many of the things I write about.

I must remember that my circumstances are not theirs, even within that commonality. There was a time I would walk through a casino almost every day, and I saw the same people. Not the glamorous people you see in commercials or ads for Las Vegas, but the *real* people, the overweight, the housekeepers, the table crew shift, the geriatrics spending their savings and social security on the hope they'll win something life changing. Desperate people are just looking for distraction before the lights go out.

I'd walk by some of these men and think, "*how is Game going to help a guy like that?*" While I do believe that Game is universally beneficial on many levels (primarily between the sexes, but not exclusively), there's a point where that improvement is going to be limited by a guy's circumstance, where he is in life, and what he's made of it so far.

Now it's a manosphere cliché, but most men aren't ready for the Red Pill. The new awareness is too much for them to accept within the context of their circumstances. That circumstance isn't based on age or a particular demographic, but Game is only going to be as liberating for a man as far as he's willing to accept it in terms of his circumstance and how far he's ready to apply it.

Not Just Sex

Ignorant critics to presume Game only ever equals PUA and “***those guys are only interested in fucking as many low self-esteem sluts as humanly possible.***” It isn’t easy to accept that Game is far more than this. It’s applicable within relationships, in the workplace (with women and men), and even in their family dealings. That’s a scary prospect for men comfortable living within their contexts and circumstance.

Sport fucking isn’t what most men think it is because they’ve never experienced anything beyond serial monogamy, nor is it what most (of the 80%+ Beta) men even have the capacity to actualize for themselves. But, as Game has evolved, it isn’t *just* about **Spinning Plates** or sport fucking; it’s more encompassing than this.

Game *is* or should be for the **everyman**.

“He only wants me for sex” or, “I need to be sure he’s interested in *me* and not just sex” are the admonishments of women who never spare a thought to how men approach intimacy with women. It makes for a good rationale when women finally “want to get things right” with a provider, but even that excuse belies a lack of how most men organize their lives to accommodate women’s schedules of mating.

The majority of men follow a deductive but anti-seductive, **Beta Game** plan of comfort, identification, familiarity, and patience with women hoping that what they hear women tell them is the way to their intimacy will eventually pan out for them. Their Beta Game plan *is* to prove they “aren’t just in it for the sex” to get to the point of having sex with a particular woman.

It’s ironic when men tell me that their plan for getting after it with a woman is to prove he’s *not* trying to get after

it with her. However, this is what most men's Game amounts to, deductively attempting to move into long-term monogamy based on what women tell him he ought to expect from himself to align with her interest. I could use the term "appeasement," but that's not what most men *want* to call it.

Most men gaslight themselves. They call it "*being a better man*" (for her), but it's better than "other guys" who won't align themselves accordingly. It becomes a point of pride for them.

Male Long Term Security

Average men want a form of security. Most men are conditioned to be necessitous. To be sure, men need to be constant performers and qualifiers to mitigate hypergamy. In the past, this performance became a part of who he was as a man and didn't require a continuous effort. However, increasingly, as male feminization has spread, men have been made to be necessitous of security.

I would say that desire for long-term security differs significantly from women's Beta Bucks side of hypergamy need since the drive to secure provisioning is an innate part of women's firmware. The security average men need is rooted in a want for certainty in his ability to meet a woman's performance standards - and ultimately avoid feminine rejection.

In today's feminine-centric social order, men are ceaselessly bombarded with masculine ridicule, ceaselessly reminded of their inadequacies, and endlessly conditioned to doubt any notion of how masculinity should be defined. Ridicule is the first response for any man attempting to explain it objectively. It's this doubt, this constant consideration of his adequacy to meet the shifting nature of women's mating strategy, from which stems this need for security.

The average man needs the certainty of knowing that he meets and exceeds a woman's prerequisites in a social circumstance that constantly tells him he never will - and he's just asking himself the question if he ever will make him that much less of a man.

The average man will look for or create rationales to salve this necessity. He'll build his ego in the image of what he thinks embodies being "Alpha." He'll adopt equalist doctrines that tell him women and men are fundamentally

the same rational actors. He'll convince himself he's not subject to the capricious whims of Hypergamy because men and women are more 'evolved' than that. A nagging doubt will manifest when the right circumstances and opportunities present themselves.

Changing Your Programming

I mention in the book that I am not a motivational speaker, I'm not anyone's savior, and I would rather men be the self-sustaining solutions to becoming the men they want and need to be – not *Rollo Tomassi's* success stories, but their own success stories. I would not be writing what I do if I thought biological determinism, circumstance, and social conditioning were insurmountable factors in any man's life.

Men can accomplish great things through acts of will; they can be masters of their circumstances and, most importantly, masters of themselves. With a healthy understanding, respect, and awareness of what influences your condition, you can overcome and thrive within those contexts – but you must first be aware of and accepting of the conditions in which you operate and maneuver.

You may not be able to control the actions of others, you may not be able to account for women's Hypergamy universally, but you can be prepared for women's nature. You can protect yourself from the consequences of that nature, and you can be ready to make educated decisions of your own based upon that knowledge.

You can unplug. You can change your programming and live a better life regardless of your demographic, age, past regrets, or present circumstances.

GAME CHANGERS

Whenever I consult young adult men, I'm constantly reminded how my "Game" has changed throughout my lifetime. The 18-year-old *Rollo Tomassi* would be appalled at the mindset of the 50s-something *Rollo Tomassi*. Granted, much of that shock would probably be due to my younger self's inexperience with female nature and essential human nature. I suffered from the same naiveté young men do when judging people's character.

At the time, my belief was no one should ever *judge* anyone's character. Female thinking constantly reinforces non-judgementalism. No one has the *right* to judge anyone. This presumption is also compounded in religious teaching, but moreover, it locks into a youthful idealism. We're conditioned to believe that you "can't judge a book by its cover," but also that you *shouldn't* do so and ought to be ashamed for considering it.

I'm flattered when people think I'm a good judge of psychology, the nature of women, intergender relations, and a model that men might aspire to get laid **and** still have a great marriage. It hasn't always been so. If I have any credibility, it's not due to my getting everything *right*, but because I had everything go *wrong* as often as not.

I learned a valuable lesson in studying psychology: personality is *constantly* in flux. Who you are today isn't who you will be in a few years. Hopefully, that's for the better. But after learning something and applying it to your progress, it could be a traumatic experience that changes you for the worse.

For better or worse, personality shifts. Sometimes slowly, sometimes suddenly, and while you may retain aspects of your personality, mannerisms, talents, past experiences, and beliefs, rest assured you will not be who you are now at any other time.

Game Changes

Sorry if that sounds kind of '**fortune cookie**' to you. It's a needed preface to understand how Game changes for men as their life situations and circumstances change. During different phases of their lives, men shift in their personalities and perceptions. If I were to find myself single tomorrow, I wouldn't approach Game in anything like the context I would as the 26-year-old version of myself. Indeed, the primary reason I expanded the **Preventative Medicine** essay series into a whole volume of *The Rational Male* was to help men understand what to expect from women (and themselves) during various periods of their own life.

In that book, I broached how Game should be a universal knowledge tool for the *everyman*. How we *do* Game will change according to context, but the fundamentals always apply. I intended to highlight how Game and Red Pill awareness benefits men regardless of their circumstances.

As I expected, the comparisons of Looks vs. Game became the predictable critique of that idea. The presumption is that a man's most evident condition is how he looks and how women are or are not aroused/attracted to their perception of him. I've written more about this *Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks* arousal dynamic (AKA: Hypergamy) than I care to recount, but suffice to say; I do place high importance on a man's physique.

However, my intent wasn't to engage in a debate over the extent of looks. Still, instead of that, Game and Red Pill awareness are applicable for men of every social or personal condition - even the short, chubby guy who empties the trash in your office. He may not have the potential to enjoy sex with a swimsuit model, but the tenets

of Game can help him improve his life within his circumstances.

In today's Manosphere, no dating coach is selling a program "guaranteed to get you 9s and 10s" based on Game savvy. The absolute truth about Game is that it has the potential to improve your life from where/who you are now. No one can guarantee you'll get with a swimsuit model, or your perfect Trad dream-wife, but if you go from being an overweight sexless five, to being sexual with a girl who's a six as a result of learning Game, well, that's an improvement.

Game Beyond PUA

When I was writing ***The Rational Male***, I specifically wrote a chapter on the ***Evolution of Game***. I included it to demystify an impression of Game which critics misconstrue as a magical solution to their 'girl problems.' My definition was this:

Just the word 'Game' seems to infer deception or manipulation for the unfamiliar. You're not being honest if you're playing a Game. So, we're starting from a disadvantage of perception from the outset. This is further compounded when attempting to explain Game concepts to a guy who's been conditioned just to be himself with women and how women hate guys "who play games" with them. As bad as that sounds, it's all in the explanation. Game is more than the common perception, which prompts new readers to have it explained for them.

At its root level, Game is a series of behavioral modifications and learned life skills based on psychological and sociological principles to facilitate intersexual relations between the sexes.

Game has more applications in a man's life than just in the realm of intergender relations, but this is my best estimation of Game for the uninitiated. *Game* is the practical application of new knowledge and increasingly broader awareness of intergender relations – often referred to as Red Pill awareness by myself and others in the broader manosphere. Game begins with Red Pill awareness and using that awareness to develop Game further. Red Pill informs Game, Game informs Red Pill.

Everyone has Game

Now for some good news: **you already have *Game***.

Everyone has Game. Every guy you know right now has some idea, methodology, or system of belief by which he thinks he can best position himself to relating with and becoming intimate with a woman. The most ranked Blue Pill Beta chump to the 14-year-old high school freshman boy has some notion about what he – and by extension, all men – should think and do to become intimate with a girl.

The effectiveness of that ***game*** is the real question.

The majority of men learn *game* via their social conditioning. Even in the most patriarchal of cultures, young men are raised on ideals of being responsible for, respectful of, and accountable to the intimate approval of women. Anything less than 100% complete honesty, genuine quality, and authentic value in a man is considered manipulative *game playing*. “**He’s a Player!**” is the epithet reserved for a man savvy enough to figure out women’s nature and leverage it to his best advantage.

Average men will always seek to level the playing field of intra-sexual competition with superior men by redefining the rules and disqualifying their rivals according to their rules—average men’s *game* centers on women’s long-term sexual strategies. Thus, any guy who develops a *game* that circumvents those *rules* is disqualified. He’s an inauthentic game player.

When a *Player’s Game* is more effective than an average man playing by the rules, this creates an inner crisis. They can either accept that women’s sexual natures conflict with their *rules*, or they go into denial and disqualify both the *Players* and the *quality* of the women who don’t play by their *rules*.

Identifying with the feminine, catering to women's "needs," and adopting a feminine-primary mental point of origin to become more *alike* with the focus of his affection is the definition of *game* for Blue Pill conditioned men. Today, this *game* is a product of 60+ years of Gynocentrism conditioning men to think that the more alike men are to women, the better their odds will be to reproduce with one.

In Evo-Psych circles, this is known as the *Sneaky Fucker* mating strategy. Males blend in with the females to gain sexual access. It's an all-in sort of strategy. The more a guy is "in touch with his feminine side," the more likely a woman sees him as "not like typical guys." If he supports *team-woman*, he'll be seen as an ally, and eventually, some empowered woman will appreciate him enough to have sex with him.

What informed and "formalized" Game comes down to is what genuinely works to better a man's life. It places men's sexual strategy and selectivity above women's, but in today's Gynocentric social order, that's risky business. Few men have the boldness to make women's needs subordinate to their own. It seems counterintuitive in a world that deliberately raises men to think in terms of scarcity, duty, and fealty to womankind.

What formalized Game represents to the *Feminine Imperative* is a threat to women's sexual selection sovereignty. Bear this in mind; depending on how skilled a *Player* you are, Game removes a degree of women's sexual selectivity. Thus, it challenges the control of Hypergamy. And even the hint of losing that control is tantamount to rape in this era.

Men don't seek out the Manosphere because their Beta *game* works so well for them. When I was in my late teens, I subscribed to the idea that men needed to be more empathetic, expressive, and sensitive to women's life experiences as the most deductive means to getting a

girlfriend—all in a hope she'd appreciate my uniqueness for being so *in tune* with the feminine.

If you'd asked me then, I'd have told you the best way to '*get the girl*' was to take women at their word. *Be a good listener*. Go to the source, use their "*advice*," be a friend first, make her comfortable, sacrifice your self-importance and prioritize her importance. Mold your incorrect, imperfect male self into a perfect feminine ideal. The lesser you made yourself, the more you make of her, and the more likely she was to reciprocate intimacy.

Even today, you'll still see this *game* reflexively played out by men. They unconsciously self-deprecate, hoping that abasing themselves will convey how incredible their woman is and how appreciative they are that she'd lower her standards for a schmuck like him.

That was my *game* until I learned that women loathe men who need to be instructed to be more attractive. I didn't understand that by subscribing to this spoon-fed feminization *game*, I was only advertising that I just didn't get it to the girls I wanted. This was the first stage of Game-changing for me. I'm pretty sure you'd read a similar story from most of the Manosphere's old guard.

When I moved into my *Rock Star 20's*, I began practicing a new form of Game, one based on social proof, preselection, and **Demonstrating Higher Value** (DHV). I had no idea I was practicing any *game* at the time. I was forced to reinvent myself. My identity shifted into that of a guy who was ***Spinning Plates***. I was more self-concerned, and I enjoyed the benefits of social proof – instinctively demonstrating higher value.

Suppose you'd asked me what I'd done to the effect that change or how my *game* was affected by it, I wouldn't have been able to give you an answer. Game was just instinctual for me. I discovered what worked **for me** with women and what didn't. I learned how to *read* women, calibrate their

responses, and be congruent with the image I was putting forward.

Later on, I learned to determine which woman was worth running the *game* on. I did all of this instinctively, via trial and error, without the benefit of a “manosphere,” the internet, or any formal *Game* learning. Human beings are social animals. We learn by *doing*. Today, *doing* has been replaced with instant presumed outcomes that retard real learning. *Doing* is becoming more alien to generations of young men whose social intelligence has been stunted by the digital society.

In my professional life in the liquor and casino world, where I interact with beautiful women every week, I still employ Game when I don’t realize I am. However, that Game is the internalized result of what I’ve learned since I believed in the “*be nice for girls to like you*” teenage game.

Amused Mastery, Command Presence, and a few other principles became much easier to employ as a **mature man**. I also have a new grasp of how women’s mating strategies follow a predictable pattern over their lifetimes. Behavioral and Evolutionary psychology taught me the methods women use to prompt and provoke men (shit tests).

Thanks to my Red Pill awareness of how women’s biology influences Hypergamy, I now understand why they do so. I also understand how to avoid the traps of falling into the worst aspects of women’s dualistic sexual strategy. All of this influences **My “Game”** now.

I don’t play a constant, conscious game of mental chess in my dealings with women (and even the men in my social and professional life); I just live it. I am the Game.

It’s important to consider that the concept of Game you struggle with now was probably some other man’s experience before you encountered it. What was Game for me in my 20s will most likely not have the same utility for me or you later in life.

But, if we stay sharp and learn along the way, we'll develop a *Game* for new phases of life. There are a lot of men who tell me they wish they knew back then what they know now.

In all likelihood, that knowledge wouldn't serve you as well as you think. You'd just make new mistakes based on things you never had any experience with now. There is always additional knowledge a man can know even when he possesses the highest Game level.

BUILD A BETTER BETA

In recent years, the concept of *Game* has been co-opted to serve commercial interests. Men tend to look for solutions to three primary problems in their lives: Building muscle and physique, making and sustaining wealth, and learning the psychology of seducing the women they want to sleep with. Make money, make muscles, and learn Game. This trifecta has spawned entire industries in what I call the *Hustle Economy*.

It's never been simpler for an average guy to become an online, niché-focused, sales funnel marketer in the "manosphere" by catering to one or more of these *male problems*. This poses a problem for the student of Game; who's legit, and who's the hustler?

Most "coaches" in this sphere came into their niché because it can be lucrative. Repackaging (see plagiarizing) long-established Red Pill concepts is as easy as a reusing the "cut & paste" keyboard command. The main problem that most "get rich quick" relationship/dating coaches run into is squaring the circle of their Blue Pill beliefs with Red Pill empiricism.

They usually want to put their spin on the Red Pill's unpalatable parts that conflict with their faith in playing fair with women. This can be as simple as ignoring unflattering truths about women's nature or as complex as fabricating a whole new "**Pill**" to sell the *better* way forward in intersexual dynamics. Hell, even female ***dating experts*** are horning in on the "*red pill*" learn Game aspect of the male trifecta.

All of this led me to research how Game principles, not necessarily Game in practice, are subverted to address feminine-centric mandates. Even the idea of "**false flag**" social media in the manosphere has been suggested to

establish a male-specific, popular perspective that might be considered more legitimate than the “*red pill*.”

The problem is that masculinity is so ridiculed and delegitimized that any lame attempt at *faking it* just makes the manosphere seem like the boys club in a treehouse shooting spit-wads at the “*mature*” girls below. Game comes off as ***game-playing*** and juvenile and only serves to make any legitimate logic appear self-serving. I understand the necessity of being covert in relating principles behind Game.

Whether it’s Game theory, PUA, MRA, MGTOW, Black Pill, TradCons, Excellence Motivators, or whatever the White Pill presumes to be, coaches in the manosphere all assume risk in publicly expressing views that proponents of feminism and Wokeism wouldn’t consider.

Professionally, personally, and to an extent, even physically, Manosphereans paint a big target on themselves. And few people would sympathize with their being damaged for their outspokenness. If it looks like *Patriarchy*, it’s okay to set their home on fire; and a feminized world of angry women and their subservient male “allies” will line up with torches to do so.

Building a Better Beta

None of this risk concerns the proponents of a fem-centric culture. They rest comfortably in self-affirming echo chambers free of risk to their career or reputations. Despite that, the utility of exploiting Game in theory (not in practice) to serve a female purpose hasn't gone unnoticed. This has given rise to what might be called ***Sanitized Game***.

They take the primary elements of Red Pill praxeology, the Game tenets that promote an acceptable "masculine responsibility," and blend them into a program to ***Build a better Beta***. And there are a ***lot*** of niche market coaches, moralist Trads, and "*Red Pill Women*" unwittingly or deliberately promoting a female-approved version of "Game."

Today's social undercurrent for men to "Man-Up" makes reinterpreting Red Pill/Game serve the expectations and entitlements of women. We get Game concepts co-opted by life coaches, social conservatives, female manosphere influencers, and even Red Pill religious revisionists nodding in agreement with Game principles so long as they serve their niche. Yet, they're still bolstering a feminine-primary message for all of their efforts to force Red Pill/Game into their idealistic box.

Most are unaware this is the message they're fronting. The point is to create a more acceptable man for a female-defined goal, *not* truly empowering men. Life coaches like *Matthew Hussey*, *The Roommates*, and *Mark Manson* have even turned this **Better Beta** male education into a marketing niche for an ever-growing number of post-30's women frustrated by the "lack of *good men*" in today's dating pool (AKA: "Where have all the good men gone!?!").

Listen to any mainstream celebrity like *Steve Harvey*, *Terry Crews*, or *Dr. Phil*, and you'll hear them repeat the same masculine responsibility mantra women believe men aren't living up to. They promote the ideal of masculinity as a dutiful Beta with *just enough* of a side of Alpha to be useful to the women they're accountable to.

There is no feminine opposite to this; there is no counter-effort to make women *more* acceptable for men. This is actively resisted and cast as a form of slavish subservience. This is the extent of the feminine reality; it's so saturated in our social fabric that men, with the aid of "*concerned women*," will spend lifetimes seeking ways to qualify themselves for female approval better.

That's the better Beta they hope to create. One who will "Man Up" and is the Alpha (as situations and its use would warrant), but who's ultimately Beta enough to be subservient to the feminine imperative. They seek a man to be proud of. One whose association reflects their quality, yet who they still have implicit control over.

Whether their reasonings are moral, entitlement, or "honor bound" in nature, the result is still feminine primacy. The sales pitch is one of finding the courage to benefit yourself, but the latent purpose is better qualifying for normalized feminine acceptance. They cannot reconcile that the same benefits inherent in becoming more Alpha (however that's defined) are the same traits that threaten his being a controllable Beta.

This is why ***real*** Game cannot be sanitized. This social element wants to keep you plugged in. More Alpha, increased value, confidence, and awareness are threats to women's sexual selectivity.

"It's great that all this Game stuff has finally got you standing up for yourself, but remember who's got the vagina!"

The fear is that men might take this Game stuff and use it for their selfish ends. The fear is men might find a hack that does an end-run around women's *female intuition* and trick them into sleeping with them. Game works, but men ought to use this superpower for good (female correct) intentions! We must teach them to Game women responsibly.

Remember this: *Anyone claiming to teach men to be better men by serving women's interests is selling you the Blue Pill. They are the crabs in the bucket that pull the other crabs back in by convincing them that the bucket was the natural Red Pill all along. Complacency, like misery, loves company. Anyone teaching Game that is not 100% about the man learning it is selling you a Gynocentric ideal.*

In the beginning, Game was about little more than racking up lay counts. For some guys, this is all they want from Game. You can't ignore the seduction intent of the origins of Game. Game was (is) for getting laid, and along with that now comes a new stigma of the **Player**. It's against the interests of the feminine imperative that a man might conceivably come to develop a secret system that bypasses **feminine intuition** and natural reservations. That's a power that men have sought for millennia.

Some might realize it to a degree through looks, power, fame, or fortune; but distributing this secret ability would be a power shift that would put women at men's mercy. With great power should come great responsibility. This is the fear that Game represents to the feminine; even the concept of men understanding women's nature must necessarily be ridiculed and shamed just for the attempt.

When women are knowable, they lose the power of their only actionable agency over men – their sexuality.

Game has evolved into much more than just a set of replicable behaviors for PUAs to ply their craft and get laid. Somewhere along the way, a man wondered why his behavior provoked the responses they do in women. What were the core reasons these behaviors and attitudes caused the desired reaction in women? Game is still about getting laid, but it's progressed beyond just the practical.

Game is a catch-all term now. It's moved on to the theory, the principle, and the psychology that makes us better men and makes women knowable. The vision you have of being a "better Man" must originate with **YOU**, not with the idealisms of a plugged-in moralist or women so fearful of your new awareness that they'll make concerted efforts to supplant it with what makes you a better servant of their insecure imperative.

Resist the idea of becoming a better Beta in girl-world and focus on being that Alpha Man as **you** define it.

PART II

GAME TACTICS

DEMONSTRATE HIGHER VALUE (DHV)

Demonstrate, do not explicate.

No man has ever **reasoned** a woman into bed, but average men have tried to do just that over millennia. Romance via reason is the primary plot device in all the best romantic teen comedies from the 1980s. In *Pretty in Pink*, *Sixteen Candles*, and *The Last American Virgin*, all of the Beta male protagonists lament their inability to convince the girl they love to come to her senses and realize he's *clearly* the guy she should be with - not the obnoxious jerk she adores.

Men are problem solvers.

An intelligent average young man usually defaults to deductive **reasoning** when qualifying himself to young women. The obvious course of action is to explain his benefits in an intimate pairing with her. After this, she can only conclude that *he* is best for her. This is the *Game* that men have defaulted to for ages.

Wooing a woman, properly *courting* her, and *dating* are variations of a man's overt displays of value intended to prove quality and communicate his interest in a woman.

If women used *if-then* logic to make their mating decisions, these guys would be the best pickup gurus in the world. However, women's nature teaches us a different lesson...

"I don't get it, man. How can Claire not see that I'm the perfect boyfriend? I'm a good listener; I'm sensitive, vulnerable, and emotionally available. I've got a great job waiting for me once I'm done with med school. My folks love her too. I tell her this all the time, but still, she keeps fucking that Jerk who

treats her like shit. I would never do the stuff he does! I respect her. She says I'm a great friend, and I'll make the right girl real happy someday."

Most women couldn't (or won't) tell you why they are attracted to one man over another **while they are in the middle of that selection process**. If you remove women from this process and ask them, "*What do you look for in a guy?*" they'll do their best to justify their preferences. The truth is women's *Genuine Desire* for a man is based on emotional associations. "**Vibe**" (short for *vibration*) is the name women give to this association, and it is this **Vibing** that ruins the deductive logic men use to qualify themselves to women. They *just don't get it*. There is a science to the **Vibe**, but average analytical men have neither the skill, nor patience to learn how to use it.

"Eggs are expensive; sperm is cheap."

No doubt you've read this in the Manosphere somewhere. It's the shorthand explanation for why "*Men display and women choose*." I'll get into the details of this in the *Peacocking* chapter, but know that men have an *instinctive* impulse to display value to women.

It's how we go about demonstrating that value that makes or breaks our Game. There is a qualifiable difference between **Displaying** higher value and **Demonstrating** higher value. Pictures of hustlers driving Lamborghinis, wearing an iced-up Rolex, and blithely lounging on private jets in Armani suits are all **Displays** of higher value.

There was a time when displays of conspicuous consumption were significant. Those value cues were hard to fake. Today, valet drivers snap Instagram pics of themselves in the McLaren they're parking to imply a similar display of value. Appearance is all that matters in

value displays, and the appearance of higher value has never been easier to mimic than today. This fact makes ***Demonstrations*** of higher value all the more critical to the modern Player.

A **Demonstration of Higher Value** (DHV) is a story or an action conducted by a man to make himself appear, or convey himself as, a person of high status, therefore making himself more desirable. There are many ways for a guy to demonstrate he is a “***high-value man***.”

This demonstration can be authentic and natural or produced through a preplanned narrative. Both require telling exciting stories about yourself or experiences while dropping in subtle DHVs. There’s an art to effective DHV. The best DHVs are hints of information that **convey preselection, domain mastery, and social dominance**. Good DHV should effortlessly establish in a woman’s mind that you are a man who ***other men want to be and other women want to fuck***.

“Preselection” is the dynamic women use from third-party confirmation to determine a man’s value. If other women want him, he is preselected — this aids in women’s evaluation of his attention.

However, the perception of preselection is also a dynamic that a skilled Player can create. In this case, preselection becomes a Game tactic that demonstrates he can attract other women who “*want*” him. If a girl can visibly see that a guy can get girls, he is immediately more attractive to other girls in the environment.

Domain mastery and social dominance qualities are demonstrated through high levels of confidence and authority. Both are attractive characteristics for women. These demonstrations naturally generate attraction through male-female polarity – the most crucial aspect of DHV.

Demonstrations of verifiable, authentic value are always preferable to creating its impression.

Don't forget this. Strategies like *Cocky & Funny* or *Amused Mastery* are far more fluid if you **have** the mastery. The *amused* part of it is the demonstration of that mastery. Of course, it is possible to DHV without holding the actual value you hope to demonstrate. This is the essence of good Game - *Dijo Sin Hablando*: Speak without speaking.

What qualities are you conveying about yourself while *conversing* with a woman? What indicators of value do you allude to in your stories, your banter, your flirtations?

Demonstrating higher value in your narrative should be something she intuitively picks up on. Covert communications and sub-communications of implied value intrigue a woman's *feminine intuition* and draw her into your *Frame*.

Often, a good, solid, direct opener will demonstrate higher value because it displays attractive behaviors like confidence, humor, and social intelligence just in your willingness to approach. In conversation, DHV implants specific "spikes" into your conversation to show your high-quality characteristics without directly stating them - which comes off as bragging. This is the *speak* without speaking part.

The last - and best - way to DHV is to have a known status. This used to be reserved for accomplished people with a degree of fame, such as rock stars, actors, or athletes, as society inherently recognizes their "high value." Overt explanations of your value sound like boasting and try-hard flexing.

Unless your cocky arrogance is backed up by verifiable authentic value, fame, and a well-known reputation for it, overt explanations of your quality are self-defeating. Fortunately, in the 21st century, a loose form of e-celebrity is easily manufactured. Just having a blue check next to your name on Twitter or Instagram is sometimes enough to earn your bonafides with women.

As in all forms of Game, congruency (where your actions always match your words) is vital. High-value men are identifiable by mannerisms matching other sexually sought-after men. High-value men have sexual options. They don't put undue interest in any particular woman. Women are innately aware of and attracted by this. In practice, this can be as simple as not fawning over a pretty girl. That *is* the demonstration part of DHV.

When a woman meets a man who demonstrates his unplugging from the Blue Pill social programming about treating her with special attention, like a princess, or clingy/needy behavior, that man becomes intriguing. Once a woman is intrigued by you, she will incrementally adopt your *Frame*. That doesn't guarantee intimacy, but it indicates that the value you're demonstrating is defining a *Frame* that she wants to be a part of.

A woman's willful curiosity about becoming a part of your *world* is the goal of DHV. The intent of demonstrating higher value is to establish *Frame*.

Women would rather play the Game than have the Game explained to them. Women cannot be **told** about your value; they must come to it by their discovery. Your value will never be legitimate to her *unless* she comes to see it for herself. You lead a woman to that discovery through demonstrations, not explanations, of high value. This is why average men fail in their deductive reasoning Game. Arguing your case for your value *never* works with women. You not only kill the enjoyable and necessary intrigue for her, but you also remove the process of her coming to you *by choice*.

Win through actions, *never* by argument.

Warning: If it seems your try-hard boasting is having the desired effect of attracting her, then beware. Going along

with your overt self-flattery is indicative of a predatory woman who's read you as an insecure "mark."

Demonstration of higher value must be performed "behind the scenes." It's never done through hitting her over the head with contrived innuendos related to past girlfriends, expensive merchandise, or feats of heroism. Neither is it discussing your future *plans for greatness*. Actions speak louder than words.

Don't explain your value - show it through behavior.

You must *be* that value rather than wear it like an expensive suit you borrowed, even if, especially if, you don't hold that value.

LEARN TO READ

“**G**ame” is shorthand for an applied understanding of social cues, environments, and intersexual dynamics. But, before you can use Game, you must be a reasonable observer. You must learn to read people, places, and circumstances. The first element of Game you must master is developing a skill for *cold reads*.

Have you ever been to a carnival and had some guy guess your age or weight? These guys are masters of the *read*. Likewise, good “*psychic reader*” fortune tellers have an instinctual understanding of people and personality types most amenable to their performance.

The best salesmen and practitioners of Game have a similar ability to read people. PUA skills are all useful tools. They can be applied in various settings, but being able to “read” your target will inform you of which Game you should use. Once you’ve *read* your mark, you’ll have a better idea of what will (or won’t) be useful in a given approach. This will guide you on which tools might work best for that job.

Guys who suffer from **approach anxiety** would find applying Game much easier if they had an accurate read of the woman’s personality they want to interact with. Think of the *read* as Game reconnaissance.

Aspiring Players tend to read up on techniques, learn a few scripts from a guru, and indiscriminately fumble their way into an approach without a concern that maybe they’re just barking up the wrong tree. Other times, they may use some pre-packaged **Cocky-Funny** routine they liked from an infield-teaching PUA, but in a completely different environment with a completely different set of conditions.

What may work on a gorgeous SMV 9 at a high-end martini bar, *won’t* play with a hot Goth girl at a *Slipknot* concert. Game critics fault the practice as a cookie-cutter,

one-size-fits-all methodology. The error is thinking all women will respond equally well to some standardized script. This is a weak criticism. The “art” of pick up relies on how deftly a Man uses Game according to his situational awareness. The foundational **principles** of Game do work on **ALL** women.

However, Game’s correct application separates those who are successful at it from the frustrated noob who tries a few techniques, gets humiliated, and gives up. Good Players understand the nuances of **Social Calibration** – adjusting the approach to match the social environment – but more importantly, adjusting Game to fit a woman’s personality and social expectations in an approach. I’ll go into more detail about **Calibration** a bit later, but understand that calibrating Game on the fly begins with your ability to *read*.

Different approaches are warranted for different situations. Reading subtleties, looking for cues with a good read when you see a woman you’d like to approach, one who’s giving you IOIs (*indicators of interest*) already, or even a girl you’re already familiar with is essential. Old school PUAs promoted the **Three Second Rule**.

Essentially, you had three seconds to go from seeing a girl you liked to chat her up. This was an effort to get guys past the “stage fright” of cold approaching. The Three Second Rule was an exercise to push past approach anxiety; it’s not an actual Game technique. It’s good to practice, but once you’re comfortable meeting new people on the fly, you must develop an ability to read your target. This requires *reading*, not just the target girl, but also the social environment and often the friends she’s got with her.

Assess the Environment

Let's assume you're going to a bar or a club, and the opportunity to meet new women arises. Before you even set foot in the place, start making mental notes:

- What kind of woman goes to a place like this?
- What day of the week is it? What time is it?
- Are you on vacation at a resort? Is it a *locals* hot spot?
- What kind of place is this? A goth bar, a martini bar, or Jimmy Buffet's Margaritaville, which all require shifts in approach. What's the typical demographic for the site?
- Is it ladies' night?
- What part of town are you in?

Knowing your venue is vital. Practices that work on a college campus at noon might not fly at a midnight rave in Las Vegas. Reading the environment informs you about which *domains* play best to your Game strengths.

Average men rarely approach out of their comfort zone. This used to be school, the workplace, or friends in a social group. More commonly, it's online dating or social media. That *domain* becomes the only environment they feel comfortable in haphazardly running whatever passes for Game to them. That's not to say Tinder or Instagram don't have a role in contemporary Game (far from it).

It is to say that Beta men tend to become *domain-dependent*; they only know how to apply some form of Game in a *domain* they're comfortable in.

This isn't a logistical problem; it's a psychological problem. To master Game, to become more socially savvy. To be a good conversationalist means **you must leave**

your comfort zone. You will never learn to read in an environment if you remain domain-dependent. To be good at reading requires you to risk going places you're not comfortable in.

Assess your Target

Once you've established a good read of the environment, let's assume you find an attractive target. This step is where things get subjective. What a hot girl looks like to one guy, is another guy's fat chick. Assessing a girl is often an obstacle for guys who are fearful of running Game. The Three Second Rule exercise doesn't count for much to guys who explain away their feigned disinterest because "There are no hot girls here, man" or, "Why would I bother with these worthless women? I have more respect for myself."

Thinking that you're too cool for any girl who wouldn't approach you first is coping. Because, even if you *were* so hot that women opened you, you'd still have to know the social skills (Game) women expect from a man who's so hot that they'd open him.

Now. I'm *not* saying lower your standards - most 80%'ers don't hold the standards they think they have - but you won't learn Game if you're self-defeatist before you even get to practice it. At some point, you *have* to acquire a target.

First, and most important, has this girl given you IOIs? In old-school pickup vernacular, this is short for ***Indicators of Interest***. These *indicators* are generally covert, nuanced sub-communications that women consciously, or unconsciously, telegraph to a guy that they're aroused by.

Reading sub-communications (or *Subcoms*) is a, critical, lost art in the age of social media dating. Subcoms are varied, but they all have one purpose - to determine if you "*just get it.*"

Her looks, vocal intonations, body posture, gestures, kinesthetics (**Kino**), facial expressions, eyes dilated, flirtations, innuendos, and shit tests are *all* part of women's covert forms of communicating interest.

Eye contact for a beat longer than expected? Hair twirling, leg shifting? You need to train yourself to actively look for the nuances in body language. Calibrating Game to interest levels in women is part of the *art* of pickup. You have to adjust Game according to perceived interest. If there are no IOIs, you'll have to adjust to catch her attention and reassess from there.

Keep in mind, only 7% of *all* face-to-face communication is conveyed via the use of words. The remaining 93% is made up of nonverbal body language (55%), with the remaining 38% being made up of the tone of voice used (I.e. It's not what you say, it's *how* you say it). ¹

Next, read her appearance – what is she wearing? Is she wearing business casual (just got off work) or made up in a short red dress (ovulating)? Jeans and a tight shirt? Is she wearing a wedding ring? Estimate her age and education level (using “chick crack” works wonders for this). Women are attention-seeking by nature; virtually everything about a woman is written into her appearance, particularly while deliberately presenting herself in a competitive social situation (i.e., a club where people go to meet other people). Accurately reading the environment will assist you in accurately assessing the target and the social conditions influencing your target.

Assess the Social Conditions

After an initial read, look around your target and read the social setting and immediate environment. Is she part of a group of girls (most likely)? What do they look like? Are they feeding her or feeding *off of* her attention? Is it a bachelorette party? Are there male orbiters circling them or in their party? Any AMOG (Alpha Male of the Group), or cock blocking potentials? Do any of them look related (evident twins, or a family resemblance)?

All of this will help you apply your game more directly. Cocky & Funny, neg hits, shut-outs, takeaways, openers, all of that can be more refined and more purposed if you take the time to observe your target and then make some calculated assumptions. If you struggle with sustaining a conversation with a woman, this is usually due to a poor read before an approach.

Many guys argue that it takes too much effort to be that analytical, but you'll become sensitive to this reading ability, and it will become second nature with practice. You don't have to be so good at reading women that you can make a living off guessing women's age and weight at a carnival. You just need to be accurate enough to know what tools in your Game toolbox to use with that woman to get you to the attraction phase and interact with her.

Final note: Accurately reading people in the context of social environments is extraordinarily difficult for guys with developmental handicaps like functional Autism and Asperger's Syndrome. If you are even marginally on the "spectrum," learning to read non-verbal cues will be your biggest challenge. Accept this fact now. You *will* need to get better at fundamental social interactions before applying Game in any meaningful sense.

I want you to know I recognize this difficulty. It's tough; I get it. **Game will not cure your social awkwardness.** In practice, it may help you get *better* with your people skills; just know that you have an inherent deficit in reading them.

As such, you may more readily misperceive social cues or IOIs and not know what to do in those situations. This can potentially be unpleasant for you, *especially* if you have difficulty regulating your emotions. Just know that this potential is not a flaw in Game. Instead, it's just the more significant challenge you face in perfecting a Game *that works for you*.

1 How Much of Communication Is Nonverbal?: <https://online.utpb.edu/about-us/articles/communication/how-much-of-communication-is-nonverbal/>

COMMAND PRESENCE

A few years ago, I went to a popular martini bar for a mixer event that one of our agencies threw for my company. It was an upscale bar with an affluent clientele. All the waitresses were easily 8s & 9s, and the bartenders looked as if they got the job based on how close they resembled Italian models. If you know any about Central Florida and the sordid details of Tiger Woods' affairs, this was one of his primary spots for a hook-up.

Whenever I'm in a professional/social outing, I pay attention to social dynamics and take mental notes. I'm always in behavioral observation mode (which sometimes bugs me, I'll admit), and I apply these observations to what I write about. I sometimes feel like the *Diane Fossey* or *Jane Goodall* of the Red Pill at promo events. Observe and record. This night was one of those instances.

At the time, I'd been studying what is called **Command Presence**. You'll know this term if you work in law enforcement, emergency services, or served in the military. My brother was in law enforcement, and he explained it as taking control of a contentious, high-stress situation by the appearance of presumed authority.

When a cop stops you for a speeding ticket, he is trained to adopt a Command Presence when approaching your car instinctively. People tend to think of cops as *generally* egotistical or arrogant, but it's this *presence* that leads them to this presumption. There are hundreds of articles on Google. Search "command presence."

The old saying, "I can't explain what it is, but I know it when I see it," applies when we speak of command presence. It's something we instinctually sense. Critics will argue that **Command Presence** is something a person is born with; you either have it; or you don't. Like a football team's quarterback who can throw a ball with natural

accuracy. It's a unique skill that not every football player can develop.

However, the athletic ability will fade with age, whereas command presence will mature over time. **Command Presence** is one of the few Game techniques expected of mature men. Like any other endeavor, it will develop with varying ease depending on your practice. Generating a command presence is something all men are capable of with time.

On this occasion, I decided to experiment with **Command Presence**. Rather than wear my usual club crawler attire, I wore a well-tailored suit with some expensive dress shoes. I never wear a tie, even at work. I've always felt a good physique is the best form of peacocking, and this met with a lot of success in my past. Still, a man in a well-tailored suit projects a different *presence* and prompts different (though favorable) responses, not only from women but also from men. **Command Presence** implies respectability.

Command Presence is founded on the associations with an appearance of authority, so it helps when you own that authority. I was the creative director of several major liquor brands at this time. This club had several complete lines of bottles I'd designed, as well as their proprietary vodka being one of my creations.

I actually am the "*authority*" in this regard, and this was (and still is) always an easy 'in' with club people. Within the first five minutes of being there, I'd gotten multiple IOIs and **Approach Invitations** (AIs) from an exquisite brunette (a solid 8.5) after my deliberate push to use **Command Presence** while talking with her. Next, was the (HB 9) waitress, who led me to our VIP section. Maybe 24-years-old and stunning, she pulls me away from the bartender and kino-walks me to where our party was meeting.

This isn't a stripper or a paid hostess; she fetches drinks. She initiates conversation with me, and I use the implied authority routine that worked with the bartender. I maintain an air of authority and take the fatherly role with her all the time. **Amused Mastery** is catnip. She's visibly impressed, more IOIs, and goes off to bring me a martini.

Later I met up with the agency people and some coworkers from my office. We were launching a new website that I worked on with them. I worked with most of the creative team, but I hadn't met the PR or research people. One of these was a fantastic blonde named *Tawny*. Maybe 25, an unbelievably hot 8.5, had a boyfriend who wasn't present.

Our logistics girl was a Puerto Rican lesbian. She'd noticed the ongoing experiment earlier and whispered to me she "*could get her before I could.*" She knew I was married and wouldn't take her bait, but for the sake of the experiment, it was game-on from that point. *Tawny* already knew who I was, so that angle was dead. I got good eye contact and caught her looking twice before introducing myself formally. I then went "*Dean Martin mature-guy*" on her and added **Command Presence** to my "*knowing all about her.*" She ate it up. I had to dial it back at this point – she was talking about us sticking around after the party, and I wasn't going to consolidate on anything. **Command Presence** was working almost *too* well.

Older single guys miss out on exploiting the maturity and wisdom that younger women expect them to have.

Think *Rat Pack*: Dean Martin, Frank Sinatra, and Hugh Hefner. These guys were high-level Players well into their 60s (even when they were married). They were celebrities, but modeling that attitude into your 40s can take you a *long* way with much younger women. Young women have an innate expectation that a *mature man* ought to have an authentic mastery over his life. I'll get into this more in

Amused Mastery, but effective **Command Presence** implies a man's respectability that comes from maturity.

Game Maxim #1: *Women want to get with a man who other women want to bang and other men want to be.*

Command Presence is the man who "*other men who want to be part*" of attraction. For women, there is an instinctive attraction to a *made* man. Hypergamy cannot afford to miss out on the opportunity for a *turnkey* relationship, the guy who's already a proven commodity in the sexual marketplace.

Initially, I posted this story on my blog to encourage older guys to adopt **Command Presence** to interact with women, but you don't have to be *mature* to make it work for you. It doesn't have to be an act for you. The part of the story I omitted is although I got a lot of female attention this night, I also got solid networking opportunities with some very influential men who picked up on this. They sought out my association. I could say it was an Alpha thing, but it's about the application in this case. I had genuine confidence in this *domain* and expressed it in my attitude and appearance. Yes, I had authentic authority in this instance, but I owned it in a respected way.

Too many older men are afraid to acknowledge their implicit power and confidence. Since this experiment, I've seen how **Command Presence** dovetails nicely with the principle of **Amused Mastery**. Amused Mastery is an excellent complement to Command Presence. It tempers the asshole impulse that can result from taking the behaviors of Command Presence too far. It smooths down what can be taken for arrogance.

Predatory animals watch and stalk their prey before they kill. They're incredibly patient, waiting for the perfect target — usually the weakest animal in the pack because

the takedown is easier. Women exhibit similar behavior when interacting with men. The guy who looks Beta and acts helpless finds himself the target of all sorts of grief from women – even if that grief is in the form of pity or indifference.

Remember, it is in women's evolutionary best interests to sort the possible Alphas from the confirmed Betas as efficiently as possible. In our ancestral past, a woman's sexual selection was a matter of life or death. To effect this, she must assess the honest signals from the fake ones. Hypergamy cannot afford to wait too long, even with the *right* guy, but neither can it afford to be wrong about assessing a guy's value.

On some level of consciousness, women instinctively understand that their sexuality – their only real agency with men – is perishable. Men's criteria for sexual selection – youth, beauty, sexuality, and availability – decay or become compromised over time. This creates a subliminal urgency in women. It predisposes them to a kind of ruthless duplicity in the sexual marketplace, but remember, it's cruelty based on perceptions. Demonstrating Command Presence is a form of *Demonstrating Higher Value* (DHV) based on congruency of appearance, attitude, and implied *Frame*. A guy who looks sharp, acts sharp, and **is** sharp, has an advantage over the guy who dresses sloppy and isn't all that confident about his status. The latter are the guys who find themselves having the most difficulties applying Game in Real Life (IRL).

In the "Brand Management" age of dating, this *presence* is easily created in photos and "staged" videos. However, it's quite another thing to **be** commanding in real-time. Most guys choke in "*approach anxiety*." This is largely because their presence seems like an "act" to themselves. In turn, this causes them to behave in a way that's not congruent with their projected image. The jig is up!

The girl's *intuition* – an ancient survival mechanism – screams **ALERT! THIS IS A FAKE ALPHA! HE'S TRYING TO FUCK YOU! ABORT! ABORT!**

While women resent your attempts to “dupe” them with your acting and make a public spectacle of you, most will low-key blow you off incrementally, or just straight up *Ghost* you. When your gut senses a shift in affectations or interest, that's your instincts reacting to her instincts telling her to back away from you. I'll get into internalizing and *being the Game* later, but developing at least the convincing *appearance* of a commanding authority will help you establish *Frame* in the earliest stages of developing an interaction with women.

- Be professional at all times. Take yourself seriously more than not. That's the best way I can put it. Self-deprecation applied too overtly, too often, and too soon will result in triggering her Beta-detection intuition.
- Good posture is *essential*. All jokes about green lines aside, the guy who stands straight and tall has an advantage over slouches and guys eager to *lean in*. Poor posture comes across as a weakness.
- Always make and maintain eye contact when speaking to her. Not creepy stares, but confident eye contact when conversing. Direct eye contact is one of the hardest things for most guys to maintain today. It's central to the human attack posture and can be perceived as aggressive.
- Directness and consistency can be important traits. Women will learn what you say is what you mean from the earliest interaction.
- ***Play*** with her, and play ***with*** her. Treat her like a bratty sister, but imply amusement. **If you treat her like a celebrity, she will treat you like a**

fan. At all times, bear in mind that you are being sized up – not just by her, but every girlfriend and relative she shares your pictures and experiences of you with.

- First impressions are *essential*. If her first impression of you is that you're meek and weak, you can expect that to color your future interactions. It is next to impossible to correct a first impression in the social media age. You must leave her with an emotional impression, with either a positive *or* negative association of a feeling she gets from your memory. Indifference leads to *ghosting*.
- Situational awareness is also essential. What is your environment? Who is she with (just women, or a mixed-sex group)? Context is key. Bear in mind, she will likely "*be a different person*" when she's out with friends than, how she will be when she's alone with you. Remember, dating is brand management. Every woman is an actress and an *entrepreneur* on Instagram. All women like to see themselves as up-and-comers in some aspect. Find out what that aspect is, and you can cater your "authority" to it.
- Size up every woman. They do it to you; you must be just as discerning. Always be aware of who - and what - you're dealing with, and stay one step ahead of her. An accurate read of a woman will save you a lot of wasted effort. Remember, the principle of the **OODA Loop**: Observe, Orient, Decide, and Act.
- Never be in a position where you're forced to be reactive. This is how unsuspecting guys get AMOG'd by more able men. It's a spook test. Are you easily triggered to react? Non-reactivity characterizes Alpha men. Alpha male animals

don't instinctively flinch when provoked by non-threats.

Effective **Command Presence** leaves no doubt who's in charge - even without speaking a word.

AMUSED MASTERY

Guys get hung up on the term “**aloof**.” The word conjures up ideas of a guy who pretends to be looking down his nose at some girl he’s mildly interested in as a lame effort to get her to qualify to him. While qualification is a crucial element to good Game, when you read how a guy needs to perfect being “*aloof*,” we tend to think of haughty, feigned disinterest. Throw that term away right now because you don’t want to be “aloof.” What you want is **Amused Mastery**.

Around 2009 *Roissy* made this distinction; “There’s a difference between an arrogant ‘aloofness’ and a confident Amused Mastery.” The presence of Amused Mastery puts you into a position of maturity while remaining playfully approachable. This attitude positions a woman to qualify to you by acknowledging your mastery of her (or **all** women by association).

An attitude of Amused Mastery implies that, by virtue of maturity and authority, you’ve “**seen it all before**,” you *Just Get It*, and you already know what women mean when they say or do what she is. And her posturing is amusing to you. You’ll play along, but only so far as to cleverly poke fun at her attempts to get you to qualify to her. This is the “**Play** with her” part of Game. It means you never take her too seriously – like a bratty younger sister – but also with the presence of mind of a senior Alpha male who knows her game before she plays it. That is the “and play **with** her” part of Game.

I never fully appreciated the potential of Amused Mastery until I had a daughter. I found myself using it with her because that’s the natural, unforced relationship I have with her as a father. When she was younger, this added to my Daddy-Alpha credentials, but now that she’s an adult,

there's a history of my Amused Mastery she finds comfort in.

I also noticed that my wife finds Amused Mastery just as appealing, to the point that she includes herself in my *Mastery* over my daughter. Amused Mastery is particularly compelling for older men/younger women Game. Assuming you're in reasonably good physical shape and have some affluence, being older gives you a degree of perceived authority. With maturity comes an expectation of knowledge and experience for men.

On some level of consciousness, women know that *men must become*. Men must achieve mastery over their lives and mission, which takes time. It takes longer for a man to become a Man. Thus, women **expect** older men **to just get it**. They expect mature men to have the lived experience to have acquired the understanding of women's natures – and they are very disappointed when an older man they're attracted to proves to be a clueless chump.

I've used Amused Mastery with my “***pour girls***” at liquor promos, and it's always very effective. You become that *Father* figure they crave but can't seem to get from younger guys. There's an Alpha Security dynamic in **play** between a woman and a man who telegraphs a vibe of having been with enough women to predict shit tests and pass them off with a roll of his eyes and a knowing smirk. When a man displays cues of Amused Mastery, there's a presumption that he *Just Gets It* when dealing with women.

Dominance

Another term that gets abused both in the Manosphere and *Girl-World* is “*dominance*.” It conjures up wrong preconceptions because it carries the same negative connotation as the word “*power*.” Women will rarely admit to wanting a “**dominant**” man, or masculine influence in their lives because ***dominant*** seems binary and absolute. Gynocentric equalism tells women that the other must necessarily be ***submissive*** if one partner is ***dominant***.

The impression of being dominant conflicts with idealistic egalitarianism – all romantic relationships/marriages should be a partnership of equals. After having been fed on a steady diet of “*independent woman*” tropes for the better part of a century, to admit to desiring a dominant man is to accept dependency on him. To this mindset, dominance is viewed as synonymous with aggression and oppression, and women and feminized men have a pavlovian response at even the mention of dominance or submission.

On the Red Pill side, we look at the truth of women’s need for dominance in men. We evidentially see women’s desire for dominance in their behaviors, popular fiction, and the latent meanings of their words.

Game Maxim #2: Treat her like a celebrity, and she will treat you like a fan.

Power hierarchies are an inherent part of human nature. Human beings will innately default to the appearance of power in others. In an age when women have default authority over men, average men will reflexively treat women like celebrities. Unlearning this reflex is key to learning Game. Deference to women must be replaced with

the confident *dominance* women instinctively look for in men. Players never treat women like celebrities.

The Manosphere has a somewhat misguided idea about what should constitute dominance. We call it “***social dominance***.” It indicates an Alpha status, but it goes beyond this. Ideally, guys imagine dominance as having his woman present while he’s issuing orders to his underlings as some form of social proof. Then she’ll want to fuck him that much harder for it. This *social dominance* is just a half-measure guys are comfortable with in not offending women. It’s not the authoritative dominance a woman genuinely needs to respect a man.

Instead, it’s a performative third-party dominance over others (usually friends or employees) or a particular sphere of influence. Social Dominance, while necessary, shouldn’t be a substitute for being authoritatively dominant with a woman (or women). Guys comfortable commanding respect amongst peers are often hesitant to be dominant with and command respect from their women.

This is usually because they’ve internalized the Gynocentric *equalism* ideal. Thus, relying on *social dominance* sounds like virtue – it’s what a *real man* does – while carefully not stepping on the toes of the *equal partnership* meme. Women enjoy the responsibility men hold in *social dominance* while ensuring men lack the authority to dominate them. Dominance is sexy, but it threatens women’s implied power.

Social dominance is essential, but women need direct male dominance to genuinely respect, love, and desire a man. She must admire you. A woman cannot look up to a man who is her equal. Hypergamy never seeks its own level. Pragmatically, it always looks up.

When ***50 Shades of Grey*** became an International Best Seller, it was an ‘***Ah-Ha!***’ moment for men. “*Women do get off on being dominated,*” but this is only one facet of masculine dominance. The popularity of that particular

type of fem-porn reinforces that women harbor sexual fantasies of physically dominant men, but does it require a sex dungeon and a BDSM fetish to confirm masculine dominance?

Intersexual dominance doesn't have to be cast in such extremes. I am the dominant personality in my marriage and my family, but that doesn't mean *Mrs. Tomassi* plays step-and-fetch-it, or wants me to include zip ties in the bedroom. Dominance is much more than roleplaying in making demands and issuing commands.

You display dominance in your speech (even your silence), the way you dress, the status implied in your career, your attitude towards people on either end of that status spectrum, your tolerance and intolerance, etc.

As men, we tend to think that the more overt our displays are, the more women will take notice, but women are far more sensitive to the nuances of our actions than most imagine. A little goes a long way. What we think are useless gestures are often memorable sub-communications for women.

That said, knowing that women require dominance from men is in no way a license to be overbearing, oppressive, or abusive. Leverage that knowledge to your best effect and know that you have a responsibility to judge where the line between dominance and abuse is. It's the difference between a woman trusting you and fearing you.

Amused Dominance

Femosphere pundits hated my essays on the effectiveness of *Dread*. I cover the concept of Dread in detail in my first book, so I won't belabor it here. Suffice to say; women don't like being made aware of their attraction to overt dominance. It's when Dread is covert that they respond most favorably. Women **love** to be objectified, dominated, and adored – but only by *worthy* men who know better than to remind her of it.

Game Maxim #3: *Women would rather be objectified than idealized.*

Women's egos are overblown on an industrial scale in the modern world. Social media has made a science of super-empowering women's sense of self. They are both *Captain Marvel* and historical victims of Patriarchal oppression at the same time. This social cognitive dissonance leads average men to a kind of *Idealization Game* that defers to the heroine or the victim narrative he senses in a woman. But women would rather be objectified than idealized. Idealization uniquely comes from lesser men; the types of men women may use for attention but never see as potential lovers.

Being objectified by a worthy, Alpha man is *far* more gratifying than the self-abasing idealization of Beta men. Women will say they want a man who *respects* them, but default respect for women is cheap from average men. High-value men don't respect women; they objectify them. A woman craves sexual objectification from Alpha men because it confirms her sexual agency. She is the kind of woman who warrants the sexual attentions of heroic men –

and the formulaic plot of *every* romance novel demonstrates this dynamic.

Good Players embrace this dynamic. They don't insult a woman with default, unearned respect, or pandering idealization. They don't slather her in self-deprecating appreciation of her *quality* as a woman. They give her what she doesn't know she wants. They implicitly objectify her in the way her ego wants to be objectified - and they are *amused* by it.

I've always advocated for the positive effect of establishing an ambient urgency of competition anxiety in women. However, this form of dominance **cannot** be an overt display. Masculine dominance must be the music playing in the background, only occasionally being amplified if a situation warrants it.

Women need to *know* it's there, but her imagination of that masculine dominance is more valuable than a constant reminder of it. Allow her imagination to fill in the blanks for her. Women also derive comfort from that background dominance, allowing her to relax more as she, willingly, falls into your Frame. Amused Mastery reminds a woman of your protection and security in a marriage, or long-term relationship.

Thus we come full circle; **Amused Mastery** is a natural behavior prompted by social dominance. That sense of knowing the answer before the question is asked but still answering with a smirk is a very effective form of ***Demonstrating Higher Value*** (DHV). An attitude of **Amused Mastery** begins from a position of confidence in social dominance.

THE MECHANICS OF KINO

The best way to practice Game is to understand the mechanics behind Game. It's important to remind yourself why what you're doing is (or should be) effective, and what the expected effect is to predict an outcome. In essence, Game is what's known as a *predictive framework*. It's a set of social and behavioral skills. However, those skills are based on understanding men and women's evolved natures. I take criticism for disassembling Game mechanics from both sides of the debate.

Women naturally hate explanations of the *crimson arts* because they acknowledge their Achilles heels by revealing the blueprints for how Game techniques and principles operate. They feel forced to misdirect or mischaracterize Game for fear of the "Sisterhood" being manipulated by less-than scrupulous men. That fear is rooted in women's *Existential Fear* – the fear of having their sexual selectivity removed, or compromised by clever or powerful men.

Male Game critics have similar misgivings, but I also get a bit of flak from Game practitioners whose only genuine concern is doing the technique work without any care for its functionality. The former uses an argument based on men's obligation to be *Authentic*, and the latter don't care how the TV works, only that it turns on when you press the power button.

Lastly, some guys think it's remedial to review Game principles and prefer theory over Game's "under the hood" disassemblies. But, theory is incomplete without practice and experimentation, just as practice is incomplete without insight and hypothesis.

Stressing the importance of Game mechanics is necessary. I sometimes get the "Stick to the theory man, we know this shit already" critiques from guys who *think* they're too cool to employ Game in a formal sense. With all

of the current debate about how Game is evolving, and to what end, I think it's necessary to explore the fundamentals more thoroughly. We assume (myself included) that anyone reading a manosphere/Game blog *must* be familiar with the techniques and concepts behind them.

I often have to defend the core principles of Game because critics don't grasp the mechanics of a particular doctrine or technique. They don't understand the theory, so they don't understand the practice.

For example, if you're unfamiliar with the function of ***Neg Hits***, why would you think a woman wouldn't react to them with anything but offense and insult? With all this in mind, I will occasionally return to the basics and hopefully help further understand why Game works. Remember that the freshly unplugged guy still in the discovery phase of his awakening doesn't benefit from reading *Mystery Method* from 2005, or even knowing what *alt.fast.seduction* ever was.

The Mechanics of Kino (Kinesthetics)

Human beings require touch and physical affection to bolster praise and self-affirmation. Children **need** physical touch in their infancy if they are to *thrive*. Babies need contact with their mothers. All OB/GYN neonatal caregivers are instructed to pick up and cuddle newborns since this human contact is *essential* in triggering a hormonal and immune response that benefits the child's survival.

All mammals, to some degree, employ this physical connection to one another, and so do we. A pat on the back, a hug from a parent, an embrace between lovers, or sick or elderly people petting a dog or cat — goes a long way for stimulating not only the sympathetic nerve and immune systems, but also the psycho-biological feelings of well-being that come from the endorphins that accompany the stimulus. That's the nuts and bolts of Kino. Your touch is a stimulus, but it's *how* that stimulus is interpreted that makes or breaks how it's employed.

Casual Kino

Kino (short for kinesthetics) is the name given to Game techniques that use physical touch. Casual kino is something we already do to a greater or lesser degree unconsciously. The act of petting a dog is Casual Kino. Once your subconscious (and sometimes conscious) has determined whether an animal is friendly, the natural unconscious impulse is to pet it. Why do we do this instead of just going on about our business? Because we have an innate need to connect with and befriend animals we might share a symbiosis with. We want it to *like* us, and establishing physical connection translates that to the animal.

The latent reason is we want to gain its favor (some would say to “tame” it), but we also experience physical pleasure from that simple act of stroking a cat, petting a dog, etc. Stress levels in humans decline when petting dogs or cats. This same Casual Kino holds for people as well. This type of Kino isn’t meant as intimate contact, so much as subtle reassurance of acceptability by that person. In other words, to tame them. In Game terms, Kino is a *comfort test*.

There are cultural and conditional rules that make Kino more or less acceptable. Dutch men and women, for instance, greet women with three kisses on alternating cheeks, and in other cultures, certain acceptability of subtle gestures of Kino is expected. Unfortunately, modern westernized American culture is probably the most uptight in this regard, and careless disregard for personal space or presuming over-familiarity with women can make a guy seem creepy if the guy isn’t attractive to her.

While contact between unrelated males is usually limited to a handshake or a pat on the back, the older an

individual is, the more acceptable it becomes to be more affectionate with them — as if there is an unconscious understanding in humans that the older an individual is the more affection that person needs to stimulate these health-benefiting responses. We're far more permissive with Kino from elderly people because we don't see them as potential intimates.

I'm sure you've encountered the "touchy-feely" kind of people? Usually, these are women because no one tries to dissuade women from touching men. Try to remember what it was about them that made them remarkable. Did they make you more comfortable, or less comfortable, in their presence? In some instances, I'm sure you could call Kino "groping," but this is when the line between subtle, casual, Kino, and intimate Kino has been crossed. Likewise, due to deprivation, the touchy-feely person betrays neediness for this contact. This conveys a subconscious message that the person hasn't been found acceptable to touch for many reasons in the past.

Using Kino

The trick to effective Kino is to make physical contact seem casual and subtle without crossing into betraying intent of intimacy seeking or to present the appearance of “needing” the touch. For instance, we may consider a slight squeeze back from a woman whose hand you’ve just grasped as an *Indicator of Interest* (IOI), but Kino is something different when a woman grabs your inner thigh while sitting down for drinks or dinner.

The same holds true for men in the opposite role of delivering a message with touch; it is much more exaggerated. Bear in mind that women are *far* more adept at interpersonal communications than men are aware of. They covertly communicate with innuendo and carefully chosen words, visual and non-verbal communications, and touch. They will understand a male’s intent when he is unaware that he is even communicating it to her — this is called telegraphing — and nothing belies this intent better than carelessly applied Kino.

Strategic Kino

Casual Kino is easy to understand, but *Strategic Kino* is an art. Recall that physical touch engenders biochemical changes in a person — oxytocin, positive endorphins, reducing stress, or stimulating arousal — this is the basis of Strategic Kino. In this Kino, we establish a reward-reinforcer relationship with our target. This principle is rooted in behavioral psychology — we reward with praise and affection for the desired behavior, but we remove it when an undesired behavior is performed.

This is effective because of an actual physical need for this contact. Reinforce desired behavior – disincentivize (not punish) undesired behavior. This *operant conditioning* is also the basis of the *Takeaway*, or “*Push-Pull*” techniques we’ll discuss later.

Kino is only effective after a dominance/affirmation-seeking connection is established. Use effective Neg Hits, Demonstrate Higher Value (DHV), and make your target see you as the prize. Without a pretext of higher value, Kino only **worsens** your approach, and you slip into the **creepy zone**. Strategic Kino is just one tool in a man’s toolbox, and using Kino before setting yourself up as the objective for her will, in all likelihood, turn her off to you. You have to establish *Frame* and a perceived value for her before initiating any casual touching.

That said, the principle of Strategic Kino is to reward your target with touch for appropriate responses while in conversation. Your target should be isolated to ensure there is no external interference. This Kino is akin to shutting your mark out in the initial stages of opening to a group by keeping your back to her and only recognizing her when she becomes insistent. Your touch becomes a

comforting reward to her once you've established a baseline for this sense of comfort.

Remember, there is a biochemical element to touch. A woman's body becomes accustomed to this on a subtle level. When it is removed (if you've made this touch valuable), women subconsciously associate the contact with approval and acceptance, while its absence connotes a lack of affirmation.

Remember, in a *Takeaway*, removing positive stimuli is not punishment; it eliminates a reward due to undesired behavior.

As with most things Game, what you're looking for is the reciprocation of your effort, which you can then escalate to a new level - ultimately resulting in intimacy and sex. Game is a dance and a language - as a man, you need to lead and direct the intercourse, but it's *essential* to see the signs of reciprocation and the willingness of a woman to dance with you. A woman's returned, or self-initiated Kino is an excellent IOI and confirmation of a willing "dance" partner.

BREADCRUMBS

We've had a recent move around of desks and people at work. In my new place, I am sitting with three girls I like:

Girl 1: *She likes dogs, looks pretty, and has a nice figure to my left. She isn't hugely confident but has been semi-competing for my attention.*

Girl 2: *She likes horses, looks nice, and has an incredible figure. She has a lot of confidence and has attempted to get my attention for most of the day.*

Girl 3: *I don't know what she likes. She looks ok, has a nice body, has medium confidence, and has not attempted to gain my attention.*

I am leaving this place in 2 weeks, opening me to date people from work.

Which one should I go for and why?

I get hypotheticals like this a lot.

Answer: Which one is the hottest? That should be your initial target and thus the one you pay attention to. It sounds like #2 is the likely candidate from the description, but why presume to settle for only one? If you're getting AIs (Approach Invitations) from all of these girls — and yes, #3 is also interested just by the preselection from the other two — why not use this to your advantage? Stop thinking like a sniper; start thinking like a machine gunner. For most men, the very concept of dating non-exclusively (i.e., *Spinning Plates*) doesn't enter into their thinking.

Most guys think, “*Rollo, you’re such a moron; how’s this guy supposed to work all three of these girls simultaneously?*”

In today’s sexual marketplace, women are *highly* competitive. Women are more intra-sexually competitive than men because, in the long-term, women ultimately need security from a high-value man. Critics will tell you this *need* is mitigated by women providing that security for themselves via careers and education, but this doesn’t eliminate the innate drive to seek security in men. This need compels women to consolidate on the best available man while her peak Sexual Market Value (SMV) affords her selectivity.

In evolutionary terms, women’s SMV is perishable, but their need for long-term security in the provisioning, protection, and parental investment they look to men for, last *far* longer than their peak SMV years. Thus, women are much more intra-sexually competitive than men. Because women are the *vulnerable sex*, evolution has coded an urgency for men’s provision, protection, and parental investment into their collective psyches.

However, women compete covertly in ways that men are usually unaware of. The pitfall our theoretical guy needs to avoid is becoming too familiar with any of these girls. To identify with women is to become another “one of the girls” in the office.

- Don’t let on (by behaviors or words) that you are seeing (or have the potential to be exclusive with) any of them or anyone outside the office either – you don’t have a girlfriend, neither are you looking for one, girls are looking for you.
- Don’t get friendly with any of them. This means no going off to lunch with any of them (or all of them). You have ‘work’ to do or are meeting ‘business

associates' for some 'big side project' you're involved in. You will have been defused when you get familiar with any of these women. They'll consider you a **brother** (i.e., *she'll consider sex with you to be incest*) or worse still, one of their girlfriends. If this happens, the odds of you becoming intimate with any of them are greatly diminished. Avoid becoming the *Sneaky Fucker* by defaulting to being a *friend*.

A Friend she sees, a Friend you will always be.

Women have boyfriends and girlfriends. If you aren't fucking her, you're her girlfriend.

This is an old maxim from my first book that many people misinterpret. It's not about sex. It's about how men and women communicate. Most Blue Pill guys believe that the best way to start their idealized relationship is to be a woman's friend. Once that long familiarity is established, they think she'll "see him for the great guy he is," fall in love with him, and then have some romantically-approved unbridled lust for him (because he did it the "*right* way"). Their Blue Pill conditioned *game* preemptively *friend-zones* themselves in the false hope that comfort and rapport will lead to intimacy. But they get the process backward.

When you become ***Friends First*** and believe that familiarity is key to a long-term relationship, you begin your *Game* by communicating as a woman would with her girlfriends. ***Friends First*** guys' *Game* is based on familiarity with a woman that requires him to identify with the feminine. They believe it's *trust-building* when, in fact, it's Beta men speaking the covert language of women. When a man tries to endear himself to a woman via friendship, a woman's hindbrain associates his efforts with

the communication of her female friends. When you communicate like one of her girlfriends, her hindbrain interprets you as a girlfriend.

The more a Beta man communicates as a friend, the more her instincts approximate him with her female friends. This creates a feedback loop. The more he emphasizes trust and rapport (via female communication methods), the bigger the shock (and rejection) when he attempts to escalate to intimacy and sex with her.

If you aren't fucking her, you are her girlfriend.

Friends First guys become stuffed animals of their creation for the women they try to play the long game with. When she discovers that stuffed animal has a hard-on poking her in the back, she becomes rightly disgusted with it and tosses it in the garbage. The jig is up! You're not a *nice guy*; you were *playing nice* to trick her into fucking a Beta male.

Beware the "*Sneaky Fucker*." Evolutionary psychology has a term for the mating strategy of *male feminists*; it's called the *Sneaky Fucker* strategy. It was coined as a result of watching the mating habits of male cuttlefish (squids). Female cuttlefish are highly selective in their mating. So, the Beta male cuttlefish evolved the curious habit of making themselves look like female cuttlefish to infiltrate the female population. Then, after having been accepted as a female, the male cuttlefish reveal their actual sex and hopefully reproduce successfully. They are *sneaky fuckers* who camouflage themselves to adapt to female sexual selection pressure. Human male feminists employ a similar *Sneaky Fucker* strategy.

Conversation

Always mete out your personal information to women, like a reward.

The trick is to mine them for information in casual conversation while dropping “**breadcrumbs**” about yourself in the conversation. This becomes second nature once you get the knack for it. Keep in mind women are naturally better with language and non-verbal communication skills than the average man. Use this to your advantage. Getting a woman to talk about herself is easy – it’s what they love most, but listening and picking up on threads in her conversation is a fundamental skill to master.

A person who talks about themselves is an egoist. A person who talks about others is a gossip, but a person who can get another person to talk about themselves is a brilliant conversationalist. The key to a conversation is to shape it so that you leave her with an emotional association with you. It bears repeating that women communicate differently than men, but they form emotional perceptions with another person (male or female) as part of that communication.

Again, use this to your advantage by making her “*feel*” you when you talk. I’m sure you’ve all heard that men are more “visually oriented” than women. However, women are more attuned to voice, touch, and smell than men. Think of her as an emotional blank canvass upon which to paint your image. All of this equates to an overall emotional perception of you.

She recalls this emotional imprint when you enter her environment (she hears your voice, feels your casual touch, and imagines you). Remember, you are creating this from your first encounter. Too many guys think that women work

just like guys and figure they can alter perceptions based on male conditions. You can't, or at least it doesn't happen quickly, and by then, it's rarely worth the effort.

Breadcrumbs - Rewarding Desired Behavior

Low-value guys always tell a girl his life story from the jump. The ***Friends First*** methodology seems intuitively sound. He's likely internalized the "*Open communication is the key to a healthy relationship*" meme sometime in life, so, deductively, more communication and more openness ought to make him more romantically successful.

So, on the first date, he opens with how his Mom is, what he wants from life and women, and telegraphs to her that he "loves" her all in the first hour of the date... then he goes home to wonder why the girl wants nothing to do with him later that week. He sold the farm on the first date.

He freely gave away any mystery and challenge that would've intrigued her by believing the common myth that women want a guy to be "upfront" and "honest." Anything other than 100% full disclosure is "*inauthentic*" and a manipulative *game-player*. This is false.

Women want a challenge more than they want honesty. There is nothing more self-satisfying for a woman than to believe she's figured out a guy's *mystery* based solely on her feminine intuition. Do not deny them the pleasure of that process by giving away your story because you mistakenly believe that open communication and "vulnerability" make you a more authentic man.

Game Maxim #4: *Women say they want honesty, but they never want full disclosure.*

It's like sports fishing. Suppose you have a marlin hooked on your line, and you immediately yank the rod and reel the line as fast as you can. In that case, you'll snap the

line, but if you slowly, methodically, pump the rod, reel the line in gradually while letting out a bit of drag as needed, and play the fish, you'll land the giant marlin. Using **Breadcrumbs** is a way of doing just this.

"Breadcrumbs" are little trails for her to follow in your conversation that lead to something about yourself that you want her to find out. If a woman is attracted to you, she'll *want* to figure you out. It's the process of determining if you *Just Get It*.

If you **overtly** tell her, "I'm studying to be a lawyer/doctor," this bludgeons her with overt information and gives her the emotional impression that you're "trying" to impress her (i.e., an egoist). But if you offer her a breadcrumb in passing about some case study you've just read, or how the long hours of your internship are dragging at the hospital, that leads her to imagine a conclusion on her own.

Game Maxim #5: *Demonstrate, do not explicate.*

Breadcrumbs are *leading the witness*. She has to make a connection to understand what you are. Prompting imagination requires that she is curious about *what* you are. If you tell her what you are, you remove the discovery process. Demonstrating what you are prompts questions and curiosity. Women don't want full disclosure. You can't tell a woman she should be attracted to you; she must come to it independently. And women love making these connections. It validates their perceptive abilities in ways men can't appreciate.

In our ancestral past, women relied on what we now call *feminine intuition* to determine a man's quality, intent, and reproductive value. Back then, that intuition was a life or death prospect; today, it's a source of emotionally validating entertainment for women. Much in the same way

that pornography and horror movies stimulate our hindbrains to lust or fear, the uncertainty of men's quality stimulates women's primal intuition. This is why shows like *The Bachelor* have been running for over 25-years. They vicariously simulate this reaffirming discovery process for women.

It gives women a feeling of accomplishment when they make these connections. As a good Player, the message you want to send her has to be picked up as a *breadcrumb* that leads her to what you want her to know. This is covert communication, something women are naturally adept at. This is an essential element to the *Cardinal Rule of Game*:

- The Cardinal Rule of Game -
Play with her, and play *with* her.

This takes practice. The key is to err on the side of being too subtle rather than too in-her-face with a breadcrumb. Most guys think women won't "*get it*" and lean into *overt* communication. They drop the interest level, or their breadcrumbs are too obvious or telegraphed. Then she picks up on your **real** intent – you expose the Game you are both playing – which is worse than just being overt because you unsuccessfully ***tried*** to play ***with*** her and failed.

Know this now, every time you fail with a woman, that failure can be traced back to you revealing the Game to her.

That rule applies to all *Game* – even the Blue Pill *Friends First* game. You revealed you were playing the game at some point in your ***Flow***. On some level of consciousness, she knows you're playing the game. All seduction requires an active participant. You know you're playing the *game*, but to talk about the game, to reveal it's being played,

exposing the code in the Matrix, destroys the purpose of ***playing*** it in the first place. Understand this now:

Game Maxim #6: *Women would rather play the Game than be told that they are playing the Game.*

Play with her, and play ***with*** her. Demonstrate, do not explicate. Explaining the Game is the root of all failures with women. It removes the *Play* aspect from the Cardinal Rule of Game. It kills the mystery and challenge that is so vital to the process of a woman investing herself in you emotionally.

Whether you're single and spinning plates, or you've been married for 20-years, appealing to women's reason and explaining the game to them is *always* the root of your failure with women. Learn to ***Play*** with her, and play ***with*** her. You are not "inauthentic" for playing the game; you're inauthentic for expecting her ***not*** to want to play it.

THE FLOW

In **Breadcrumbs**, I was focusing on one aspect of an overall whole of applicable Game. I assume most readers already have some grasp of this, but I can be hasty in these assumptions. Men looking for practical information on Game are unfamiliar with the techniques and principles that support them. It's a shame to think a guy's first experience with Game would come from a *juvenile* mindset.

It's little wonder average men spit the Red Pill out after being told to "*just neg the target bro.*" It's difficult enough for most men to come to terms with their fem-centric psychological conditioning. Still, doubts about the legitimacy of an evolving *Game*, courtesy of adolescents, are enough to drive a man back into his Blue Pill cocoon.

In **Breadcrumbs**, I was alluding to an element in the overall ***Flow*** of a date (or approach). I use the term "date" here in its loosest meaning; no one really "dates" anymore, but there is a *progression* in engaging a woman you have an interest in, whether you're on date number three, in a relationship, or you're working for a same-night lay.

The Process

As odd as this will sound, there is a natural “**flow**” to a date that escalates to intimacy. Much of what the old-school Pickup Artists taught was an emulation of behaviors that follow this **Flow**. Every PUA *technique* is a behavior-set most men never figured out on their own, either from fear of rejection or simply lack of opportunity. Using Kino, Cocky & Funny, Peacocking, open-ended questions, conversational skills, isolation, escalation, etc., are all parts of this **Flow**.

When a guy gets stuck at a particular stage in this **Flow**, the date or approach breaks down, and interest level waivers. It may be him or her, often a combination of both, but the **Flow** stalls out, and intimacy is not achieved.

For a guy used to rejection and sexual deprivation, the natural impulse is to blather out as much information as possible in the shortest amount of time for fear that he won't get another shot at the only girl in recent memory who accepted his approach. As mentioned in *Breadcrumbs*, he disrupts the **Flow** and ceases to intrigue the woman. His attention and mystery cease to be valuable because it's **too** available.

As counterintuitive as this seems (and contrary to the popular belief that women want full disclosure and complete honesty), women want to read a man chapter by chapter, each chapter being a new reward for her escalating interest.

Game Maxim #7: *Nothing is more self-satisfying for a woman than for her to think she has pieced together who you are using her feminine intuition.*

The average Beta man rattles off his life's book summation from the back cover and feeds her the cliff notes all in the course of a two-hour date. He vomits his story out all over the restaurant table - or worse, all over her DMs - and mistakenly believes it's just a necessary step to get to intimacy and familiarity. He loses the initiative. His sense of mystery is gone, his challenge and attention are too quickly given, and he is, therefore, worthless because she didn't have to earn the knowledge of him. In his mad rush to get past the awkward stages of arousal, he clumsily attempts to develop rapport. This denies her the satisfaction of having to "figure him out."

Embracing the Flow

The guy who successfully escalates is the Man who's conscious of this natural flow and isn't afraid to sometimes pause it, be deliberately ambiguous, or halt it all together to leave her wanting more — then restarting it, should it hang. This is the essence of what's known as the ***Push-Pull*** technique. A man who has romantic options isn't afraid of keeping his mystery and challenge about him. In other words, a high-value man doesn't have to *try* to be attractive to women. Women covertly pick up on the behavioral manifestations of a man accustomed to being desired by women.

Women will describe his attitude and behavior as *confident*. He communicates confidence in ways she picks up subconsciously, which becomes a reward for her interest. High value, Alpha, men display behavioral cues they develop through being rewarded with prior women's sexual interest. These cues are a form of organic preselection - Alpha men's behaviors naturally imply they do not need to qualify themselves for any woman's approval. They are a challenge to women because they ***do not need to be***.

This is the natural "breadcrumb" ideal that maintains **Flow**. Give her just enough breadcrumbs about yourself to pick up the next one and lead her where you (and she) want her to be. A woman's imagination is the most powerful tool in your Game toolbox. Most *Game* tactics are a deliberate manipulation of this **Flow**. Critics of *Game* techniques claim they're inauthentic and disingenuous, but those techniques are founded on aping the mindset and behaviors that go with a natural **Flow** that is authentic.

Be Her Drug Dealer

I should note; there's a significant biochemical element in women experiencing this intrigue. A person can develop a 'tolerance' to the natural endorphin cocktail certain stimuli prompt if they are often exposed. When engaging a woman, the last thing on the average man's mind is the hormonal responses being triggered for her while the 'date' progresses. The emotional association you're looking to prompt in her is also chemical.

The most straightforward illustration of this is the "action date" theory; do something exciting with your target for her to associate that feeling with you. On the front end, she's jet-skiing with you in South Beach, but her body is producing adrenaline and dopamine in excitement on the back end. The ideal state is very *Pavlovian*; you want the mental image of you to create the same effect in her body chemistry. Maintaining that rush doesn't have to come from bungee jumping or sky diving. Those same chemical triggers can be stimulated with indignation, *jealousy*, lust, intrigue, suspicion, imagination, etc.

All the food her mental hamster needs to spin the wheel is fair game. Triggering base emotions is critical. Average men underestimate a woman's nuanced sensitivity to the prompts that trigger this biological response. I can't expect every guy to keep this physical truth in mind when he's having a good time with a woman, but understanding this will give you insights into what to do with her and how to talk with her.

Being a mystery and a challenge to her triggers this biochemical reaction.

Average men believe the right idea is doing the intuitive thing; perpetuate comfort and familiarity by rattling off as much detail about yourself in the shortest amount of time to get to intimacy. It seems to make sense since every guy has been told the way into a woman's pants is to make her feel comfortable and trusting of him. Be her friend, be sensitive, listen to her, etc. Average men don't appreciate anxiety from sexual tension in attraction.

The arousal and attraction phase is uncomfortable for average guys. They have no skill in it and become self-conscious because they don't expect to be successful in arousing her. The predictable response is to avoid discomfort. So while she may be high on endorphins at the time, his rationale is still deductive – make her comfortable. But this is ultimately self-defeating because it puts comfort and familiarity before arousal, urgency, and sexual tension. It puts the **Flow** out of order.

When a woman orgasms, her system is flooded with oxytocin – a hormone associated with trust-building, comfort, love, and rapport. A similar effect is manifested in men; however, comfort, familiarity, and rapport are post-orgasm feelings. They are anti-seductive. Sexual tension, urgency, uncertainty (dread), competition anxiety, lust, and raw arousal are testosterone-based, pre-orgasm feelings. This biological dynamic describes the psychological process of the **Flow**.

The average man desexualizes himself in the mistaken belief that comfort and trust are seductive. He sells the farm, makes himself an open book, and essentially kills the impetus and breaks the **Flow**. When a woman tells you she “**sees you like a brother**,” what she's describing is your too effectively creating familiarity. Prospects of incest are an innate revulsion (disgust) response in humans.

The Manosphere joke is that any woman who tells you she thinks of you as a brother means she considers having sex with you to be incest. That joke has a kernel of truth to

it. Average Beta men believe that familiarity will lead to a wholesome passion. What they end up doing is fashioning themselves into a woman's brother. They put comfort and familiarity before arousal, urgency, and lust; thus, they break the **Flow**.

SHIT TESTS

*Women's shit testing (sometimes also referred to as "fitness testing"), is a psychologically evolved, hard-wired sexual-selection mechanism. **Women will shit test men as autonomously and subconsciously as men will stare at a woman's big boobs.** They simply cannot help it. And often enough – just like men staring at a nice rack, or a great ass – even when they're **aware** they're doing it, they'll still do it. Men want to verify sexual availability to the same degree that women want to verify a masculine man's dominance/confidence.*

In the early days of PUA, the now-ubiquitous shit tests were a novel challenge. It's essential to put this testing dynamic into context. Any guy who's ever chatted up a woman will tell you; there's a phase in every approach when a woman will challenge a guy with a *fitness test* to determine if he is who he says he is. However, as any married man will tell you, that's not where the shit tests end.

My nephew and his sister are now adults, but I watched them playfully give each other shit constantly when they were growing up. There's the fluid teasing and taunting that comes from siblings that genuinely like each other. My brother and I used to smack each other around and roughhouse like boys used to be able to do before society decided they needed to be sedated for their behavioral "problems."

There's also a natural *flow* that's learned between an older brother and a younger sister that correlates with intersexual dynamics between men and women in adulthood. Learning this dynamic provides the key to solving the problem most men later have with shit tests, as well as the key to capitalizing on them.

No Passing

Too many guys today see shit tests as a pass-or-fail proposition. Men like that deductive win-lose proposition, but the problem is that “***passing***” a shit test implies finality. You will *always* be shit tested by a woman, even with women that you’ve shared a lifetime with. You never really *pass* that test. You can, however, turn those tests to your advantage. *Red Pill* women (and Purple Pill “life coaches”) shy away from offending the sensibilities women like to call these “fitness” tests. The renaming sprays a bit of perfume on an unflattering aspect of women’s innate sexual strategy – shit tests are part of women’s evolved mental firmware.

PUAs were correct. Calling this sexual selection filtering “*shit tests*” works because the nature of those tests were much like the “shit” they’d given (and been given) throughout much of their lives. Part of the male experience is giving your friends “shit,” ribbing them, insulting them, and otherwise talking “shit” with them. You probably get that “smack talking” has been raised to an art form if you’re in a fantasy football league.

In this context, it’s not so much a *fitness test* as it is a form of male-specific camaraderie. If it’s a test of anything, it’s a test for the social intelligence that a guy ***just gets it*** his friend is giving him ‘shit,’ laughs about it, and give as good as he got.

This is part of men’s overt form of communication. It baffles women unfamiliar with it. If I’m playfully insulting you, if I’m *messing with you*, it means I consider you a friend, and I expect that you’ll “*just get it*” when I do.

Sadly, this is the first offense women take when they insert themselves into **Male Spaces**. They take the “shit talk” personally, or at the very least have to make an effort

to communicate in the open, often vulgar, but no less meaningful ways men do. Unless they were raised in a household with a strong masculine influence (fathers or brothers), it's likely women won't "just get it" and bend their efforts to change that communication to something she's more comfortable with.

Reading the Test

Even if you had the benefit of having your bratty sister punch you in the arm after teasing her, you might not realize this is a form of shit testing you. One of the most important aspects of dealing with a shit test is understanding the basic fundament of **Just Getting It**:

*A woman wants you to “**just get it**” on your own - without being told how. That initiative, and the experience needed to develop it, is what makes you a man worth competing for with other women.*

Women despise a man who needs to be told to be dominant.

*Having to overtly relate this to a guy entirely defeats his credibility as a genuinely dominant male. The guy she wants to fuck is dominant because that’s **the way he is** instead of who she had to tell him to be. Observing a process will change it. This is the root function of every shit test delivered by a woman. If masculinity has to be explained to a man, he’s not the man for her.*

This is the fundamental basis of women’s sexual selection process. A woman wants to know a guy who **Just Gets It**, but she still needs a method to determine that he does. For women, this method must be as covert as possible to protect the integrity of not exposing their sexual strategy to *themselves*.

Remember, the **Cardinal Rule of Game: Play** with her, and play **with** her.

Observing a process will change it. This refers to what’s known as **The Observer Effect**. There are several contexts of this effect, including physics and psychology. The basic idea is if a person is aware of being observed,

they become self-conscious, and their thinking, reactions, and behaviors adjust to align with what they believe is expected of them.

The *it* in ***Just Get It*** is the playing of the game as opposed to revealing that a “game” is being played at all. Women would rather play the game than have it told to them (i.e., the Observer Effect). Being a good *player* of the game communicates authenticity, social savvy, and familiarity with female nature – all indicators of an Alpha male psyche formed by being rewarded with the sexual attentions of women who came before her.

Men who *Just Get It* instinctively manifest behaviors and mannerisms that reinforce higher value and preselection – which is made all the more authentic if that man is (or seems) unaware he is displaying those qualities. Playing the Game while being aware *of* the Game is the hallmark of a sublime Player.

Women would rather play the game than be told that they are playing the game – so much, so they evolved psychological schema to ensure they don’t become self-aware of that game. It seems like madness to men striving for a rational solution to a problem when analyzed like this. However, her shit tests come from a need of **not** having to convince her hindbrain that he does ***get it*** — and gets it so well that he neither acknowledges it overtly nor asks for her assistance in figuring out her shit tests.

Observing and explaining a process will change that process.

A woman’s hindbrain knows this. This is why *Demonstrate, do not explicate* has been a Red Pill/Game maxim for over 20 years now.

Women use shit tests to determine men’s authenticity in one or a combination of these factors:

- **Genuine Confidence** - First and foremost
- **Sexual Options** - Is this guy really into me because I'm "special," or am I his only option?
- **Long-Term Security** - Is this guy capable of providing me with long-term security?

All of these requisites imply testing for masculine dominance and sexual market value. Women want a man that other women want to fuck, and other men want to be. The primary conflict in women's shit testing is she must determine if a man has sexual options other than her while simultaneously limiting those options and making herself his primary focus. Knowledge of this conflict is a critical advantage in confronting a shit test as a Game practitioner.

There's always some debate over women being unaware of their subconscious shit testing or if those tests come from deliberate intent. Do forethought and malice come into play with shit tests? There's always going to be a want of women to accept personal responsibility for their actions. Shit tests seem like a colossal waste of time. They seem duplicitous and mean to men who value straight-talking solutions. I will argue that these tests are intentional *and* subconscious, depending on the context in which they're delivered.

Intended or not, it's more critical guys accurately *read* a woman's testing. Know that it's rooted in an inherent Hypergamous uncertainty. Generally, shit testing is a good sign of interest in a woman. She's interested enough to *want* to resolve her uncertainty about investing in you emotionally. That uncertainty extends to both the Alpha Fucks and Beta Bucks aspects of her sexual strategy. Women's doubt of a man's suitability is a constant, subconscious, effect for her. That **Hypergamous Filter** asks two questions:

1. *Is he who he presents himself to be?*
2. *Is he the best that I can do?*

Active Testing

If a woman actively shit tests you, understand that it is always intentional. This shit test is the most common one you'll encounter in clubs, bars, social settings, etc. Except for maybe *Day Game*, women in these *sexual zones* expect men to approach them. Therefore the impulse to deliver a shit test is a conscious decision.

These tests amount to a fun game for her (and her friends) to determine your sexual market value, authenticity (genuine cues), if you *Just Get It* (does you know how to *play*?), and your Hypergamous potential (is he a same night lay or *boyfriend material*?).

Active tests are entertainment for her in the same dynamic as a *Bratty Sister* and *Older Brother*. She gets off on the rush that comes from the uncertainty of trying to figure you out. There's an opportunity for witty ***Push-Pull*** banter to this test exchange. Her subconscious is probing you for the possibility that you might '*get it*' - that you might be able to *play* the game rather than having to explain it to her or having it explained to you.

Never overtly explain to a woman that she's just delivered a shit test to you.

That kills the *vibe*. Gamma males do this constantly. They keep mental spreadsheets in their heads and explain the Game to women as a form of Game. They mistakenly believe that exposing the Game will cut to the chase, eliminate shit tests, and any reasonable woman will see him for the superior male specimen he is for figuring her out.

My friend *Vox Day* once said that women talking with Gamma males felt an unexplainable desire to punch the guy

in the face. That desire stems from having the Game explained rather than being an effective player. He gets it, but he doesn't get how to use it. He **plays** with her, but he lacks the social savvy to play **with** her.

A woman who is into you won't confuse you, but average men come to believe that any impropriety on their part might be taken as offensive. They never push back on these tests as they should. Instead, they fall back on the "Yes M'Lady" white knight script they believe sets them apart from "other guys."

But, the guys who "*get it*" aren't confused by shit tests. A big brother hits his bratty sister back when they play-fight. Not to harm her, but just enough to show her who's stronger, who's in control of his situation, and isn't afraid to push her back. The guy who *gets it* reflexively, playfully responds to a shit test.

A master Player knows how to turn those tests back into qualifiers for her to pass. Think of it as ***Game Judo***: use your opponent's energy against her. She *attacks* with a test – you riposte with a similar test using her test to springboard into your own. In doing so, you show that you *Get It*.

This is the heart of ***Agree & Amplify***. The concept is simple. When you're hit with a shit test, agree with your girl, and then amplify your agreement. When an active shit test comes in the form of an accusation of you, your reflexive response should be to sarcastically agree with her assessment then amplify it to as absurd an extreme as possible. This is *Game Judo*.

In agreeing and amplifying her test, you tacitly acknowledge the test (***I get it that we're playing a Game***), take control of it, and turn it back on her. Some examples:

Her: "Why didn't you call last night? Are you dating someone else?"

You: "Yep, I've got a harem to service. Be happy you're in the top tier."

Her: "Sometimes you can be such an asshole. My ex knew how to treat a lady."

You: "I bet he did. You should beg him to take you back. I could use the peace and quiet."

Her: "I didn't like the way you flirted with that girl at the party tonight."

You: "I know, I'm a massive flirt. Good thing you didn't see the other ten girls I flirted with. Phew!"

You get the idea. Don't memorize this verbatim as some script to follow. Consider them the spirit of the rules and create your own as opportunity permits. To Blue Pill conditioned men, this tact seems counterintuitive. The average guy walks on eggshells with women in his mind for years before he even has a girlfriend. It's okay to give her shit. It's even necessary to convey value to women (by doing it *playfully*).

Redirecting her shit test telegraphs to her that you're confident enough in your value to risk offending her. Average men don't have the opportunity to leverage any third-party preselection or social proof. They don't realize they can imply that preselection through attitude, language, Game, and behavior. The guy who is preselected naturally manifests it in who he is, and women instinctively read this.

The Prime Directive of Game: *Playing* with her to play ***with*** her.

Self-confidence, genuine or not, triggers a submissive emotional response in women. **Confidence is derived from actionable options or the knowledge of having**

created opportunities in the past. Women read confidence in a man as “having options.”

Remember **Game Maxim #1: *Women want to get with men who other men want to be, and other women want to fuck.***

Men who other men want to be and other women want to fuck implicitly have options. Preselection is implied confidence. Once this is established, she's faced with the urgency that she might not be selected as one of your options. It doesn't matter if, objectively, you aren't the best she can get; what matters is that you *think* and *act* like you are. It's not about authenticity at this stage; it's all about perception for her.

Game Maxim #8: *Flip the script. Be the chased, not the chaser.*

Always presume the state of being chased. Old-school PUAs used to call this “*The Prize*” mentality, but guys took it too literally. Presuming a state of desirability turned into “*act as if you have a 10-inch cock.*” If a woman is not testing you in an environment where she could reasonably be expected to be doing so, she likely doesn't have the interest in you to bother doing so.

Average men mistake a woman's “**Bitch Shield**” (AKA: Resting Bitch Face) as a cue of disinterest or disgust. The truth is, most of these are calculated shit tests. There are many ways to push past a *Bitch Shield* for a guy with the balls (and interest) to do so, and it can pay sexual dividends. However, it's a woman's indifference, not her bitchiness, that cues disinterest.

Active shit tests are what single men are most likely to encounter in women. It's important to understand that this type of test isn't something you pass but rather something you capitalize on. Shit tests are an opportunity not to be

wasted. For a guy with a basic grasp of Game, the active test should be considered nothing but softballs for him to hit out of the park. The things to remember are Amused Mastery, Command Presence, Agree & Amplify, and a basic Cocky & Funny ambience.

Also, women deliberately putting themselves into social environments (like a club) and delivering active shit tests are more likely to be at the ovulation point of their menstrual cycle. That's not *always* the case. But, if you see the other signs of women in their proliferative phase - adjust your Game (and birth control methods) accordingly. If you recognize that you're being actively shit tested, always remember, ***play*** with her, and play ***with*** her. Shit tests of this nature are *opportunities to build attraction and arousal*, and women who are attracted to you *want you to get that they are opportunities*.

Passive Testing

While active tests are delivered with intent by women, passive shit tests are a reflexive, subconscious test rooted in women's Hypergamous insecurities. In an active test, the purpose is to playfully determine the quality of a new prospective mate. A passive test is rooted in the doubt that a woman's choice to settle into monogamy with a man was the best one her Sexual Market Value (SMV) could afford her. Passive testing always asks the question her nagging hindbrain can't give a voice to:

"Did I make the right choice? Is this guy the Alpha I thought he was or could be?"

"Is he really the best I can do?"

This is an existential fear in women. The Hypergamous Doubt is (almost) never definitively answered: *Did I select the best man I could? Is he my soulmate?* What women refer to as **Female Intuition** is actually a psychological mechanism that 100,000+ years of evolution has wired into women.

Hypergamous Doubt has never been more anxiety-producing for women than now. Today, women's sexual opportunities are unprecedented in human history. With every passing decade, we see that a woman's sexual past has repercussions in ways men's sexual history doesn't. Passive shit testing is constantly exacerbated and defined by women's previous sexual experiences (or lack thereof). Who has she fucked in the past that's better than the guy she's with now?

Furthermore, the fantasies of what could've been if her circumstances were to change are even more pervasive. This is the mental space where the "Alpha Widow" dynamic is born for women. This dynamic is the subconscious testing of the man whom she settled on to compare him

with her past, *idealized* experiences - or the experiences she believes could be possible *if* she could determine his suitability for her.

For the most part, these tests compare his performance and provisioning capacity against his Alpha arousal-generating capacity. Passive tests are more insidious in that they need the satisfaction of so many Hypergamous elements: Alpha Fucks, Beta Bucks, the outperforming of past - or fantasized - sexual competitors, push-back masculine dominance, status, money, emotional investment, and other prerequisites of long-term Hypergamous optimization.

The passive test is usually reserved for marriages and long-term relationships. Unfamiliar women rarely give you a passive test; however, you might get one from your mother or a close female relative who needs some reassurance from you (or wants to put you in your place as a Beta). Passive tests seem the most hurtful. It's important to predict when they'll come, what's triggering them, and the root insecurity behind them.

Few women are consciously aware of passive testing. When they are, they can't openly reveal them because it ruins the game and determines if you "*just get it*" without being told. As with active tests, demonstration, not explication, is the key to resolving and capitalizing on them. These are the types of tests that aggravate most men because they generally feel they're obligated to fix them. Thus, they make grand affairs of bringing a woman's 'bull shit' to light to quell her insecurities. They also feel like they're reasonably holding her personally accountable for her "stupid shit testing."

Women enjoy *their* problems with you.

If you're a married or monogamous practitioner of Game, remember, **appealing to a woman's reason** never "solves" her problem. Passive tests are born in emotional insecurity. You will never *solve* an emotional problem with rational solutions. You're speaking the wrong language because **Hypergamy doesn't reason; Hypergamy only feels**.

Demonstrating you *get* what she's doing will help you capitalize on and quell her insecurities *far* more than explaining that you know what she's doing by shit testing you. When women fixate on their *unsolvable* problems, men think that solving them will pass that shit test and return balance to the relationship.

However, the problem itself is the source of the indignation that makes her feel alive. They don't *want* the problem to go away when it's the source of emotional stimulation. When men, to put it bluntly, rationally try to solve her emotion-based problem, it removes the source of the pleasure she had in talking and empathizing about it. This is made worse when *he* is the problem she fixates on. The key to resolving this, by the way, is to tacitly remove the reward women get from fixating on the issue, not solving the problem itself - if it was a problem at all.

Passive tests are commonly generated while a woman is in the luteal phase of her menstrual cycle. When that insecurity relates to her partner's Alpha suitability, there is some crossover into her proliferative (ovulation) phase. Married men need to determine the nature of their wife's insecurity about her tests and when they're most commonly delivered. Why? Because, if she's testing you at or around her ovulatory window, if she's regularly insisting on a **Girls Night Out** around this time (yes, it's a shit test), if she's

not sexually interested in you during her **estrus**, odds are - she's uncertain about your Alpha Fucks suitability to her.

If her tests come during her luteal phase, odds are she's nagging, passive-aggressive, concerned about money, or wants to live closer to her parents. It's likely her insecurity is based on her perception of your status, provisioning, protection capacity, or your Beta Bucks potential to make more of it. All shit tests are born from Alpha Fucks or Beta Bucks.

While passive shit tests seem like a lost cause, understand that many of the same techniques used to capitalize on active tests still apply. Not all passive tests are delivered in the negative. Applications like *Command Presence* and *Agree & Amplify* demonstrate to a woman that you *get* it; you see her tests for what they are. You're prepared for them without revealing the game you both know you're playing, and that implies confidence and security. Well-timed *Amused Mastery* can defuse a passive shit test without the negative implications.

Once the precedence of your mastery is set, it's an easy fallback she'll come to expect from you. Granted, there are more direct ways of demonstrating your value to her - staying in better physical shape than she's in is an obvious one. Casually emphasizing **passive dread** (married social proof) is another. The important part is recognizing what side of the hypergamous equation generates insecurity.

Now, the most apparent response men will have to all of this:

"Fuck all that! I'm not dealing with her bullshit! Just don't get married, just don't put up with it, just go your way, hold her accountable, call her on her bullshit!"

To which I'll say, "Yeah, you're right, it makes more sense just to disconnect entirely."

It would be great if women could be rational, reasonable agents, all responsible for their feelings and actions, and

adjust their attitudes accordingly. If men and women are functional equals, they should be. You should say to a girl or your wife, “Hey, I know all the games your playing and why you’re playing them, so let’s just drop all of the pretentious bullshit and get down to fucking and living, okay?”

But, this all boils down to you negotiating for her genuine desire. Natural desire on a woman’s part *never* comes from rational, reasonable diagnoses of why she *should* desire you. It comes from your demonstrations of value and the examples that you set. Even the men who rule over their women with an iron fist will *still* deal with women’s tests directly, or indirectly, without realizing they’re doing so.

The take-home lesson here isn’t about the lines you memorize. Lines are training wheels. They’re meant to help get you through common traps women set for aspiring Players. Lines should be viewed as supplements to your primary objective: **improving your attitude and internalizing the principles of Game into your character.**

At some point, you have to start writing your script. Once you have the outcome independent, care-free asshole attitude internalized, the *lines* will come naturally. They’ll be a reflex fitted to the context. Experience with women, plus the alpha attitude that grows out of that experience, minimizes the times you’ll be caught flat-footed or shocked by some girl’s shit test. Your heart rate won’t rise, you won’t sweat, your tongue will be quick, and your smirk of *Amused Mastery* as natural as the zero-fucks-given *lines* you instinctively converse with.

Neo: “So, you’re saying that I can dodge bullets?”

Morpheus: "No, Neo, what I'm saying is that, when you're ready, you won't have to."

ABUNDANCE MINDSET

How many dates max before you fuck her?

Coming up with hard and fast Game rules of engagement is that there's always going to be a caveat or special conditions for the particular girl a guy is focusing on. Even when there's not, guys are prone to think, "*There's just something special about this one.*" Plate Theory (non-exclusive dating) is integral to Game because it encourages men to disabuse themselves of believing each woman they draw interest from is a unique snowflake.

It's hard for an average man to think of a woman hinting at IOIs (Indicators of Interest) and not think she's predestined for *him* by his scarcity mentality. When you're starving in the desert, crackers seem like mana from heaven. A scarcity mindset and Player mentality are diametrically opposed. Therefore, an abundance mindset is a prerequisite for Game.

Risk and Reward

In Game, there is a subtle balance to be recognized between risks of over-investing in a particular woman, versus the worry of throwing the proverbial baby out with the bathwater. Women will naturally come down on the side of gaslighting a man's assessment of a woman's potential value – both in long-term perspectives and possible sex.

This doubt is a failsafe social convention for women: ***“If only you'd been more patient, if only you invested a little bit more, you'd be rewarded with a great mother for your children and the best pussy of your life - don't blow it now!”***

Short version: *It's not in women's sexual-strategy interests for men to have sexual options.*

Women's sexual strategy is schizophrenic. Ideally, women want a man that other women want to fuck, but to assess his value to other women, he's got to have exercisable options for her to compete against. That, or he's got to display indirect social proof to that effect, at least. **She needs to limit his options while simultaneously determining that he actually has those options.**

Game Maxim #9: Women don't want a man to cheat, but they love a man who *could* cheat.

Now add to this the logistics of maintaining a reasonable pool of suitors to determine the best one among them for short-term sexual and long-term security benefits. Fostering a scarcity mentality in men works well in women's reproductive interests. Studies show that men innately tend to overestimate women's interest in them, while women underestimate men's interest in them.

This evolutionary outcome is the best-practices result of women reinforcing scarcity in men. Most average men are considered unattractive to women (at least 80%). In these conditions, it's easy and pragmatic to over-inflate female value through men's scarcity of sexual opportunity.

Pragmatism

Men should also adopt a pragmatic mindset in light of women's sexual strategy; in the sexual marketplace, you're another commodity in Hypergamy's estimation. Guys have a difficult time training themselves in thinking this way. I'm not suggesting you kill your romantic, artistic souls in favor of cold calculations. You must keep that side of yourself intact for any future relationship to thrive. ***Plate Theory*** and efficient Game can seem *dehumanizing*.

However, what Game denialists fail to grasp is that they're already operating in a *dehumanized* market. Feminine social conditioning makes men believe Game is inhumane because the feminine imperative has become synonymous with "correct" humanity. In Gynocentrism, to be more like a woman, identifying with the female experience, is more *human*.

Pragmatism should be the prime directive of your Game.

For instance, with just average Game, in three dates, you should be able to *determine* if her desire level is high enough for her to *want* to fuck you. The pragmatic operative of the "Three Strikes Rule" isn't pushing for a hasty same night lay; it's about determining genuine desire and not wasting time with low-interest women.

Notch count is not the metric of Game.

Any Incel can pay for sexual access. Genuine desire is the metric of Game. But, to get to genuine desire, you *must* assume your value. This requires an abundance mindset.

From a pragmatic, long-game perspective, average men have the potential to attain and hold their SMV for *far* longer than the average woman. Women's prime sexual agency years span from 18 to 28-years-old, peaking around 23-years-old these days. This is roughly a ten-year window for the average woman to consolidate on the *best she can do* guy for the remainder of her life.

A woman's need for long-term security is far longer than her peak years afford her to find it throughout her life. Savvy Players understand this timeline and adjust their Game (and their goals) accordingly.

Conversely, men have much more time to mature into their peak potential and remain at a higher SMV for longer than the average woman. Most men don't realize this potential and those who do only realize it after they've made life-altering commitments to bad investments in women. And all because they lived in a mental state of scarcity reinforced by women for most of their lives.

The popular belief is that men are too full of themselves. We have fragile, fluffed-up egos that get threatened by a powerful woman. Macho masculinity is an inauthentic mask men need to validate their image of themselves. Nothing could be further from the truth. For centuries average men have been conditioned to thank the gods for their good fortune in finding a woman who'd have a schmuck like him. Most women find most men unattractive.

Until the advent of hormonal birth control, women were forced to compromise on ugly men in favor of long-term security. But even before the Sexual Revolution, men felt blessed to have a woman agree to start a family with him. Scarcity was and still is endemic in average men. In the 21st century sexual marketplace, this scarcity mentality is a cinderblock strapped to the necks of average men.

The message here is simple; in the long term, as a man, you have far more abundance than a Gynocentric society would ever allow you to think.

Critics of my work get very upset by my suggesting that a man never considers monogamy (or marriage) before 30. There is a pragmatism to this. It takes longer for men to mature into their peak potential than for women. A woman's peak sexual selectivity necessarily comes before men's.

However, when men hit their SMV potential in their mid-30s, the script is now flipped, and it's these higher SMV men who have the benefit of selectivity. *Very* few men get to this state unencumbered by prior personal commitments. They failed to grasp their abundance in the long term and were blinded by short-term rewards they believed women were gracing them with before they realized their potential.

ART OF THE AMOG

If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the results of a hundred battles.

- Sun Tzu

A contentious aspect of intersexual competition that early PUAs hit upon was the phenomenon of the **AMOG** (Alpha Male Of the Group), and how ***that guy's*** social dominance focused all interaction within a peer group on himself. The AMOG was a straightforward parody of a guy to hate for Game practitioners because his archetype was relatable. The nefarious AMOG was their worst cock-blocking villain.

However, the AMOG was made all the more evil because he hindered hooking up with the beautiful women that Game was just now granting them access to. For recovering Betas experimenting with Game for the first time, it was bad enough dealing with the proposition of rejection by women.

To have to deal with a guy that acted like the typical jock who bullied him in high school was intolerable. Men's competition anxiety focuses on a very overdramatized caricature of the Alpha "bullies" they were familiar with when growing up. This characterization is also the basis of the long-clichéd plot of every boy-meets-girl, boy-overcomes-shyness, boy-overcomes-bully-to-get-the-girl story ever told - and not just by Hollywood.

Female-written romance stories revolve around multiple suitors for a woman protagonist to tame. She usually selects the most Alpha among them - usually the one who's a misunderstood *Beast* to everyone but her. Male written romance generally centers on a hapless Beta male (with a heart of gold) who, through extraordinary circumstance, is placed in a position of outperforming all of his rivals.

His exceptional performance gets him his dream girl, or the girl he “*should really be with*” instead of the shallow girl he thought would be so great. Instead of selfishly abusing his newfound Alpha superpowers by kicking sand in the faces of lesser Betas, he fashions himself as the heroic example of how Betas should act if they find themselves in similar empowerment.

The stories of *Spider-Man*, *Captain America*, and *Back to the Future* all follow these Beta male-romance scripts to the letter. In every story, the Beta-with-a-chance has to teach the bully a lesson before he can qualify for the girl’s attention and intimacy. This clichéd story arch manifests men’s internal acknowledgment of the male ***Burden of Performance***.

While I can’t assert this is an intrinsic part of men’s mental firmware, I have to speculate that the fantasy of fulfilling it is part of men’s innate need to perform for women’s intimate approval. Regardless, the objective purpose is still to “get the girl.”

Examples of this Alpha bully archetype are part of most men’s formative learning. Not all men learn the lesson of the bully (some play the role with relish), but if we hold to the ***Pareto Principle*** 80/20 rule of the Manosphere, we’re statistically looking at around 80% of (Beta) men who do. From grade school, to high school, to college, *that guy*, the douchebag, the guy who can’t help but actively or passively draw attention to himself, becomes the AMOG – and damned if he’s not the most obnoxious bastard you know.

I’m highlighting *that guy* because, more often than not, he’s less a natural person and more a manifestation of the anxiety that results from men’s insecurity about measuring up to female approval. It’s easy to poke fun at the guys you see on social media because they’re representations of the bully you hate. They’re the jerks that every woman loves, and every “normal” guy tries to make women understand are the worst possible romantic option for them.

A difficult hurdle men have in unplugging is getting past what they believe is emulating the Alpha Jerk who so regularly outperformed them, if not bullied them. His asshole ways were undeniably effective with the women he wanted to get with, but it feels wrong to become the guy you hated. There's a natural resistance for men coming to Red Pill awareness to become *that guy*.

This AMOG archetype impression is tough to confront for men, but they must do so.

This hated AMOG impression for men is a handy tool for women's sexual strategy later in life when the woman he's held in high regard finally "**comes to her senses**" around her ***Epiphany Phase*** and accepts him. For men with this AMOG mental impression, that woman's acceptance comes with a certain degree of (sometimes smug) vindication.

He waited her out, and she finally "*realizes*" what he's been trying to make her see for so long - that he's the "perfect boyfriend" for her. He doesn't realize he's playing the convenient 'savior'-provider role women's sexual strategy has prepared him for. She needs to *stick the landing* before she's 30, and he's her best chance to help her do it. He believes his Beta Nice Guy life track has finally won out over the nefarious AMOGs. This impression is a reinforcer of a belief women need him to firmly hold when it's time to cash in their Beta Bucks chips, and her sexual market value starts its decline.

And therefore, those skilled in war bring the enemy to the field of battle and are not brought there by him.

So what do you do with an AMOG? I'm going to flip your AMOG impression upside down. *That* AMOG isn't the one you should concern yourself with.

Most early PUAs suggested a process of containment and isolating your target woman to "poach" her from *that*

guy. The isolation idea is to remove a girl you like from her social group to eliminate outside noise. Still, the effect is similar to Mate Guarding – isolate her awareness of all other sexual competitors and focus her attention on you.

But, unless you're making your approaches in clubs or loud bars, it's likely the context you're *working* on a woman in isn't one where an active, in-your-face AMOGing is happening. Isolation becomes a security measure to focus on you being her best immediate prospect.

Roissy once proposed there are groupies for every male endeavor. There are also AMOGs in every male endeavor. In every group of nerdy programmers, geeks, chess club guys, your bowling team, and even in your Bible study group, there's an AMOG. Some are more significant than others, but rest assured you know him or will soon.

Men compartmentalize themselves socially to best facilitate their chances of meeting, banging, marrying, or otherwise interacting with women. This compartmentalization is a form of *Buffering* against rejection. Still, it's also a logical positioning of a man into an environment where he can (hopefully) excel and be noticed for it. You will always have intra-sexual rivals in this life.

ALL WARFARE IS BASED ON DECEPTION

Bear this in mind when you enter into a new social group dynamic or an unfamiliar social environment. You are an unknown commodity, and therefore your strengths are novel to the group. Your weaknesses (your Beta-ness) will be more evident than your strengths and thus more easily attached to you from the outset.

Listen, here's the thing. If you can't spot the sucker in your first half-hour at the table, then you are the sucker.

- Rounders

Playing to one's strengths usually involves defining a man's social environment. King Douchebag at a Vegas pool party is excelling in his environment, just as *Bobby Fisher* is at a chess tournament. Less socially adept men enjoy more confidence at a ComicCon because the environment buffers for their social deficits, but it can also emphasize their particular talents.

The first mistake most men make when considering an AMOG situation is underestimating the importance of that environment. The setting was probably set for you in high school, but you've got a greater degree of control over it as an adult. When you're confronted with a guy "all the girls love," keep the context in mind. There's a tendency to think the AMOG is a "natural" Alpha when he's actually domain-dependent on the social environment you share with him. Bring him to your field of battle.

There will always be guys who excel in almost any environment because Hypergamy is universal to women and a "hawt guy" is "hawt" to all women. But remove him from his preferred domain to one you're adept in, or

outperform him in his domain with a particular strength or expertise you possess in such a way that he's forced to acknowledge your skill.

To know your Enemy, you must become your Enemy.

The caricature of an in-your-face belligerent AMOG is a social anomaly. Usually, your experience of him is the product of an environment you're not at home in. Far more common, however, is the AMOG, who is an unassuming, pleasant, and honestly great guy you probably can't help but like. This likability is his primary appeal. Obvious Alpha superiority combined with marginal humility makes for an irresistible AMOG to women. He AMOGs you effortlessly because he's not trying to. Never think that all AMOGs have to be belligerent assholes.

Game Maxim #11: *Be the AMOG without being an AMOG*

One of my best friends to this day was a guy I despised when we were in high school. We ended up becoming lifelong friends, but initially, I hated him for having a natural Alpha affinity with the girls I wanted to get with. I attribute part of my early 20s sexual success to many of the lessons that women's behavior around him taught me. Both the nervous Beta and the PUA like to encourage the idea of an AMOG as being the drunk, loud-mouthed frat boy who straight-arms you aside to get to the girl at the bar you're working ("*Step aside McFly!*").

But, the Alpha Male of the Group to consider is the guy women can't stop talking about when he's not even present. He's the guy who leaves the room, and girls giddily huddle together to agree about how "hawt" he is.

He doesn't even have to be in the group to be the Alpha of it. The best form of social proof is the unsolicited kind. The kind where women can't help but talk about a guy and ask his Beta-chump friends for his Instagram URL.

He who knows when he can fight and when he cannot will be victorious.

In the immediate sense, unseating this AMOG would be a challenge only the most exceptional men could hope for. You can look for weaknesses and toss out witty banter hoping that women will have the presence of mind to appreciate it, but if he's established in his environment, his status and social proof are reinforced for him within his social group. This situation may seem hopeless, and if your goal is to supplant him, you'd have to consider what the rewards would be in doing so. However, there is much to learn from him within that shared environment. Pose as a friend, act as a spy.

Befriending an AMOG may be your best option as it opens you up to his social proof as a peer. You may not replace him in the short term, but if you're spinning plates as you should, his confirmation of you as a peer will only benefit you. This confirmation will allow you an insight into the dynamics of that social environment.

Your ultimate success doesn't lie in destroying the AMOG, or even becoming one yourself. but in mastering a shared environment where your strengths are best applied. Resist the urge for revenge on all the jocks, whoever wronged you in high school by using blunt force.

The supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting.

Pretend inferiority and encourage his arrogance. The opportunity to secure ourselves against defeat does not lie in our own hands, but the enemy himself provides the opportunity of defeating him.

This tact is helpful for both the in-your-face AMOG and the non-direct, status-affirmed AMOG. Sometimes proving one's superiority is just allowing others the time and opportunity to be mediocre. The trick, of course, is being prepared to swiftly capitalize on that AMOG's missteps but not seem like you're trying to capitalize on it.

Law 33 - Discover Each Man's Thumbscrew

Everyone has a weakness, a gap in the castle wall. That weakness is usually an insecurity, an uncontrollable emotion, or need; it can also be a small secret pleasure. Either way, it is a thumbscrew you can turn to your advantage once found.

- Robert Greene, The 48 Laws of Power

In the early part of my career in the liquor industry, I worked for a wealthy man in his mid-60s. This man had quite the resume of "successes," but for the greater part, they'd come from his self-importance, and borrowing money, than any natural talent of his own. He was the owner but had a reputation for attention-seeking and love of flattery that bordered on arrogance. His self-affirmation would come at the expense of whoever happened to be outshining him as the master. He was a consummate AMOG but with no real legitimacy.

At one point, we had a necessary negotiation with a Chinese distributor to get our brands into an Asian market. As he'd typically do, he wanted to entertain the reps over dinner after a big trade show we'd met them at. They were impressed with *me* because I was responsible for the

company's creative side. However, even with my deferring credit to my "boss," he took it as an opportunity to AMOG me in front of his new "friends."

I saw this coming (it'd happened on other occasions), and I had a good prior knowledge of the sensibilities of the Chinese men from my time in casino marketing. I *diplomatically* let him hang himself with his self-aggrandizement and bluster at my expense. Predictably the reps were put off by this bravado. We lost the distribution. However, it wasn't for nothing.

About a year and a half later, I was offered a string of very lucrative branding contracts for several of this Asian company's holdings (two of which I still rep now) because of this patience and letting my boss implode. All I did was see it coming and let him hang himself.

Every AMOG has a weakness to exploit. Sometimes discovering this requires patience most guys don't want to wait around for. But it doesn't take long to find the thumbscrew with a bit of tact and attention to detail. I think the older a man gets, the easier it is to judge the character of others (or it should) - you experience the "types" enough to gauge a predictable character action.

Exploiting mediocrity is also the basis of the classic **Boyfriend Destroyer Scripts** (next chapter). The premise breaks down a girl's boyfriend's reputation by indirectly whittling away at most relationships' predictable areas of contention. Emphasize his Beta attributes while *leading* (not telling) her to consider and appreciate your Alpha attributes. Yes, it's terrible form. Yes, your efforts would be better applied to new prospective plates to spin instead of working on some girl with a boyfriend.

That said, learning the Boyfriend Destroyer Scripts is an excellent study in understanding how to deconstruct an AMOG and learning his *thumbscrews*. There's little Game value in actively poaching other men's women, especially

when those women will Game themselves if the opportunity is irresistible enough.

Lastly, **Amused Mastery** isn't just a technique to hold women's attention; it's also an effective tool in defusing an AMOG. Once you have an understanding of that AMOG's weakness – a penchant for self-aggrandizement, a taste for booze or a *kind* of woman, a lack of legitimate ambition, Beta thinking/behavioral tendencies, etc. – the plan then becomes one of emphasizing those character flaws indirectly by drawing attention to them.

Women love a man who ***Just Gets It***, and the best, playful way of expressing that is with Amused Mastery. But it's even sexier when that Mastery extends to men who she perceives are your intersexual rivals. This then, by association, compliments her ego for your Amused Mastery of her.

The best possible outcome is to deftly destroy the AMOG without his realizing it while making your target woman understand that you just did.

THE BOYFRIEND DESTROYER

Because the “*I have a boyfriend*” shit test is so commonly encountered when picking up women, resourceful men figured out ways around it. These workarounds fall into the following categories:

- **Acknowledge it:** An example of this would be replying, “Oh, that’s cool. Hey, you can bring him along when we go for a drink.” Or: “Every girl has some guy they call a boyfriend.”
- **Ignore it:** She says, “I have a boyfriend”; you say... “Hey, check this out. Which fingers do you wear your rings on?” or something innocuous.
- **Make a clever retort:** For instance, she says, “I have a boyfriend,” and you reply, “That’s cute. So does my girlfriend! We have something in common.”
- **Preempt it:** Before she has a chance to use the “I have a boyfriend” line, you say, “I’m surprised you would come to a place like this without your boyfriend” or “Does your boyfriend know you’re out here tonight?” and see if she bites. The upside is it saves lots of time avoiding low-interest girls. The downside is it reminds her of the boyfriend if she has one.
- **Indict the boyfriend:** The idea here is to plant a seed of doubt in her mind about her boyfriend (or strengthen the doubt already in her mind). “Do you need your boyfriend’s permission to talk to a cool guy in a bar?” [Look around] “I used to let my girlfriend go out with her friends a lot. It was good because I could do my own thing when she wasn’t around.” [smile mischievously] “Where’s your boyfriend now?” Ignore her answer.

- **Question her independence:** Nothing works better than presuming an *independent* girl is beholden to her boyfriend these days. “You’d better give him a call and tell him you’re not doing anything bad. Some guys worry.” You will have to follow up with something cocky and funny. You have to own this. Any incongruence in boldness is best covered by more boldness.

All of these responses are examples of ***Playing with her***. Like any great tactician, a good Player understands the superficial move and the purpose behind it. Which one of the above countermoves is most effective?

It depends on the girl, the congruence of who you present yourself as, and the environment you’re in. The key is paying attention to the point in the conversation when she delivers the ‘I have a boyfriend’ line. If she says it right away before you’ve got two words out of your mouth, it is most likely not a shit test to determine your fuckworthiness.

Either she doesn’t like your Beta vibe and is letting you down preemptively, or she does have a boyfriend, and she’s a woman with integrity by letting you know this upfront before you waste your time Gaming her.

On the other hand, if she talks with you before saying it, and she has dropped a few IOIs your way, there is a good chance it is an artificial hurdle. She either has a (rapidly fading) boyfriend, and she’s open to being seduced by you, or she doesn’t have a boyfriend and her saying it is just a simple shit test because she’s a woman of low character and social retardation.

Either way, you should assume her boyfriend’s objection is meaningless because it is. The third possibility, and the most dangerous female ploy, is she has a boyfriend she is not going to cheat on but omits this vital information so she

can delight in the ego-stroking you give her with your flirty attention. As explained above, the only way to avoid time-sucks like this is to preempt the boyfriend excuse.

The problem with preemption is that it risks setting an anti-seduction tone. Over the years, I found that a minority of women will deliberately string men along for attention.

How will you know if she's open to being seduced away from an imaginary (or not) boyfriend, or if she's just using you for validation? The answer is in her facial expressions. A woman who looks apologetic when she drops the boyfriend bomb and turns rapidly cold after saying it is an attention whore. She enjoys the good feelings you gave her for twenty minutes.

But, if she is still engaged with you after mentioning her boyfriend, and her flirty demeanor hasn't let up at all, you can safely assume the ***boyfriend disclaimer*** is an excuse.

Verify her continued interest by isolating her privately. This is critical. A girl in a relationship who has no intention of screwing around on her boyfriend will not follow you to a different location, no matter how good your Game is, how much she likes you, or how close the new spot is. The venue change/location move is a reliable test for smoking out the attention whores.

THE UTILITY OF BETA MALES

Many of my readers presume I write from a position of Alpha *authority*. I have jokingly referred to myself as a “Lesser Alpha” – at least according to *Roissy’s* 2009 metrics. I’m sorry if this disillusions anyone, but I’ve run the gamut from being a well-conditioned Blue Pill Beta, to being a verified-by-social proof rock star “Alpha,” to dropping almost into an *Omega* status with a psychotic girlfriend, then to maturing into a Red Pill aware, *Lesser Alpha* I would humbly think of myself as today.

A lot of critics (and a handful of Red Pill men I know) have a tough time defining what they believe are arbitrary terms – *Alpha, Beta, Delta, Gamma, Omega* (all socio-sexual hierarchies), *Blue/Red Pill*, etc.

But let me reiterate, these terms have always been abstracts. They are placeholder words for more significant ideas, not binary definitions. Critics believe that *Blue Pill, Beta, Omega, White Knight*, etc., are dismissive insults meant to end a debate. Again, these are **abstract terms** used to describe a man’s condition. Being *Beta* or *Blue Pill* isn’t a life sentence, and neither should it merit scorn.

It’s hard to look at ourselves, or our past selves, from the perspective of a guy enduring the same Blue Pill conditioned delusions we had. The *Beta* orbiter’s role describes a guy who Red Pill men can somewhat empathize with because they ***used to be*** this guy at some point. They made the same mistakes based on foolish Blue Pill preconceptions about women. In this respect, try to understand the following from an objective viewpoint of what it was like to ***be*** that ‘hopeless orbiter’ basing decisions on misguided beliefs.

The following story was about my friend *Goldmund* when he was invited to socialize with a friend and who he’d

thought was a *couple*; a nice-looking 23-year-old woman and her dutiful Beta “pseudo-husband”:

“It was Sunday evening, the weather was pleasant, and being around a group of great guys who were eager to learn had me in good spirits. A text came in from a friend who said he was hosting people from out of town and wanted me to join them all for dinner. I met them at a restaurant and sat down to eat.

*At first, I thought the two attractive people he hosted were a couple. They were both from Australia and sitting next to each other at the table. I noticed that the guy was catering to the girl, not standing his ground in conversation, and ended up paying for her. After dinner, we all went to a bar where a band was playing, the girl came over to me, and we started to chat. I immediately asked her, “So, is that your husband?” and she responded with “Oh, no, he’s just a friend” and gave a hungry ‘**save me**’ look.*

*[...] The Australian guy stood next to the girl while I walked closer to the front, and after the first song, I looked back and waved her over. She came right away, and the guy glared at me like I was Satan. She stood right in front of me and began dancing a little. While I rubbed my crotch on her wiggling ass, my hands went to her hips, then felt up her flat stomach before caressing her big boobs. I said into her ear, “**I’m going to take you on a date right now,**” and she looked back and smiled.”*

You can probably see where this was going. Beta male orbiters can simultaneously be their own worst enemy, while reinforcing the Alpha impression of his sexual competitors. That Beta *friend* only serves your social proof by displaying his lower value. You may deem this *Black Hat*

Game, but don't feel too bad; that orbiter's status is already set in a woman's hindbrain in most cases. Any other man's status is measured against his pathetic nature.

Game savvy men should know that Beta orbiters are an opportunity to establish implied social proof. Orbiters strengthen your Game and aid in your demonstrating higher value because a woman compares his status to yours. This is made all the easier when she's unfamiliar with you. You become the swarthy, sexy outsider.

You can only fuck that impression up by being too direct. **Women want men who other men want to be, and other women want to fuck. True or not, to a woman's mind, her impression of an orbiter's status means *you* are a man he wants to be like - and the guy she and other women *should* want to fuck.**

In most instances, there's no reason to AMOG an orbiter. Remember what I said in the last chapter; sometimes, all you have to do is allow a rival to prove his mediocrity to set yourself apart. We'll get to this in a bit, but understand most orbiters are unwitting volunteers in aiding a Player to boost his signal by complaining, doubting, and criticizing his Game (or his ethics).

Average men *always* resort to reason and logic in explaining a Player's ways to women. They believe that exposing the Game will prove a higher value to the woman he's fixated on. But in doing so, he demonstrates that he *Just Doesn't Get It*. By calling out the Player, the average Beta also reveals the Game - and women would rather play the Game than be told they are playing a Game.

Because of this, it's far easier to use *Game Judo* with a Beta male cock-blocker than a woman's female-friend cock-blocker. Stay objective here. Focus on what's transpiring and why it's working. Whether you're the oblivious Blue Pill orbiter or the Red Pill seducer in a scenario like this, your education comes from observing the process.

We went to the back of the venue, and my friend came up to me and said, "Hey man, listen, that guy is really upset that you are hitting on the girl."

"Well, she surely isn't going to fuck him; they aren't together."

"Yeah, but he paid for her to come out to New York [from Australia], and last night, he told her that he loved her"

I couldn't help but burst out laughing.

While this conversation was going on, the guy went up to the girl and begged her not to leave with me. At this point, I despised him, especially after my friend informed me that he had referred to me as "a creepy predator" and wanted to teach him a lesson that stung, especially since he was taller, better looking, and much more arrogant than me.

You'll likely have a tough time with the ethics of this scenario. Let's run down a few facts we know at this stage. "**Pseudo-Husband**" is now the kind of Beta who pays for non-interested, or semi-interested, women to go on international trips with him. Women getting, "**Flewed Out**" (*flown out*) is the popular term today. I could write a whole chapter on this, but any Red Pill-aware guy already knows the mindset of the Beta sexual resource exchange - also known as the **Savior Schema**. It's a conflict between *Transactional Sex* and *Validational Sex*.

It gets interesting when you account for the **Sugar Baby** transactional companionship/sex dynamic going on today. It's easy to think a **Sugar Daddy**, paying for a woman's exclusive attention, would simply vote that girl off the island by closing his wallet. But when you mix pride, alcohol, Beta Game, and the expectation-but-not-expectation of sex with a **Sugar Baby**, that can make for a volatile combination.

An ROI (Return on Investment) is expected when you pay for a woman's international vacation. *Goldmund's* approach shifts at this stage; but, being the seasoned seduction artist he was, he has more than enough intel on the guy and enough IOIs from the girl to get the lay. *Goldmund* made it personal, but we'll discuss this later.

"Pseudo-Husband's" impression of *Goldmund* as a "**creepy** predator" is another *Beta Tell* about his status. "*Creepy predator*" is fem-speak. It's what I'd expect from a woman, but it's a dead giveaway of his conditioning when it comes from a man. *Goldmund* expertly Games this woman and has sex with her at the venue. However, to continue with the analysis of this girl's orbiter, let's skip ahead to some select quotes:

*"Her (post-sex) face was red, and we had been gone for about 20 minutes, so when we returned to the table, I was 100% sure that everyone knew what had just gone down. The guy didn't say a word while the rest of us chatted about sex over drinks, and when I got up to go home, he didn't say goodbye. I told my friend to mention **The Rational Male** to him as I was leaving.*

Major lessons found in this one, and they are so clear because a few years ago, I could picture myself being in the loser's situation (I wouldn't go so far as to pay for a chick to fly across the world, but I've done some extremely pathetic things in attempts to woo girls). Game taught me that girls are incredibly sexual creatures, love being dirty, think about sex often, need it, and want to get fucked by wild men.

I'm sure the Australian guy never thought the girl was capable of having sex in a bar bathroom by a stranger, yet it happened right under his nose. It's hard to think of a better example of getting friend-

zoned than this guy who had spent 1000s of dollars on the girl to confess his 'love' for her, only to be cucked by some Player she just met."

This is a hard lesson for a Blue Pill man to learn before understanding the importance of being Red Pill aware. "Nice Guy" orbiters/friends rarely need to be AMOG'd because they're ignorant of the nature of Hypergamy. Old order Blue Pill beliefs will have them AMOG themselves. Even those who've experienced it personally from a woman or had it flaunted in their face via ***Open Hypergamy***, these men still *want* their dream girl to be somehow different.

Many a White Knight has been knocked from his horse after having the truth of women's sexual natures viscerally illustrated for him. It's the guy who goes into denial, who falls back on the romantic "***Quality Woman***" belief and gets back on the white horse who is genuinely lost.

I've been friend-zoned before and remember it being some of the most frustrating, mentally clouding times of my life. This guy was seething with anger so bad; he couldn't even speak - or attempt to fight. The friend zone is anguishing. Overcoming happened when I started reading stories like the one above and started assuming every girl has slutty tendencies and will use weak guys for money, attention, gifts, or whatever they are lacking.

Having your Blue Pill ego-investments dispelled in such a brutal fashion often leads to two types of misdirected anger:

1. Anger at the sexual rival who just schooled you in the most personal way possible about women's Hypergamous sexual natures.
2. Anger with a woman (or women) who are simply incapable of appreciating, or abiding by, the old

social contracts; the old books he believes all *good* women abide by.

Men's anger is not so much about a loss of investment as it is about a Blue Pill man having his inner world destroyed by outer world facts.

There was a point in my own life when *I* was similar to the Australian guy. I'm glad *Goldmund* mentioned my site and books to this guy's friend because I'm still hopeful for men like this. I've had a few men in the 'sphere tell me I shouldn't care about men who don't want or don't know how to compete intra-sexually.

Due to their arrogance or ignorance, they're not worth educating. One less sucker in the sexual marketplace is a good thing. But that's not what my goal is. While I understand that sometimes it's necessary to ***Ghost*** on men, that shouldn't be your first impulse.

If the dude were cool about the situation and humble enough to talk to me like an adult about it, I would have gladly given him some advice and probably just got the girl's number and arranged to meet her privately.

Ego is the reason most people stay Blue Pill. You have to be honest with yourself and admit when something is wrong. Then find ways to fix it.

Hypergamy and Evolution both want "*Hoes Before Bros.*"

I once ran a Twitter poll asking whether it should be considered a Red Pill-aware man's duty to educate Beta men about their Blue Pill beliefs. The consensus was men ***should*** help other guys. That's encouraging, but it's not always advisable. Despite all of the attraction and arousal Red Pill-aware men can generate in women with Dark Triad personality traits, they still believe they can

compartmentalize those traits when it comes to helping their fellow man.

Should *Goldmund* have backed off this girl out of respect for a man trapped in a Blue Pill feedback loop with her? Or did his actions do both him and her a favor?

I've personally had one of my best friends bang a girl I was locked in the friend zone with. I'd tried for months to get her to respond to my pathetic, Blue Pill, "*I really care*" **Beta Game**. I was 19 the night I introduced him to her. After meeting for only an hour that night began, a literal fuck-fest between them that lasted two months. It was a hard kick in the nuts to take.

My good friend and the girl showed absolutely no awareness or regret for fucking, but it taught me a precious lesson. All the bullshit about "**bros before hoes**," all the idealistic pretty Blue Pill lies I believed about being friends and comfort first before sex, went right out the window that week - where they belonged.

It was hard to take, but it was exactly what I needed to experience. This is a hard line for Red Pill men to cross today. I expect *Goldmund* was really into banging this girl that night more than he wanted to teach this guy some object lesson. However, it's a problematic area for Red Pill guys to sort out when "helping" Blue Pill guys unplug.

I'm reminded of the story about a guy who taped a note about banging another guy's girlfriend under the toilet seat (knowing the boyfriend would eventually lift it to piss). It read, "**Sorry, Bro, she didn't tell me she had a boyfriend until after we fucked. I would want to know if I were you.**"

What is a Red Pill man's ethical responsibility to Blue Pill men?

No Neutral Balance

Frankly, losing the “beta” qualities would make it difficult to live a happy, successful, and fulfilling life. But they have become stigmatized because they are associated with men being used by women.

The Beta Bucks side of Hypergamy centers on the three *P's* in men, *Provisioning*, *Protection*, and *Parental Investment*. These aren't inherently lousy *Beta* male traits. If anything, they're net positives for women who'll need long-term security from men for most of their lives. What they aren't is *seductive*.

Security traits in men are inherently anti-seductive, and increasingly so in our brand-managed, social media-fueled sexual marketplace. Even when a woman *needs* a man for his long-term benefits, the three *P's* aren't what get's her wet.

I lock horns about the necessity of Beta traits with TradCon/White Pill bloggers. The problem is at least 80% of men already possess these attributes in spades. Beta Game relies on maximizing the characteristics that satisfy the Beta Bucks side of Hypergamy. There will always be a gross overemphasis on the value of those traits because they're the only strengths 80% of men can play to.

Game Maxim #12: *Alpha must be your predominant character; There is no Beta with a side of Alpha*

I don't believe in a balance of Alpha to Beta traits. In terms of efficient Game, men should emphasize Alpha traits as their predominant set of attributes. Expressing Beta traits should be limited to maintaining a minimum comfort level. This comfort level should only be apparent to reinforce low-frequency anxiety to hold a woman's

continued interest in a man. *Natural* Alpha men do precisely this without thinking about it. **There needs to be a distinction between Alpha and Beta behavioral sets and Alpha and Beta mindsets.**

Average men are raised into a Beta mindset. They're taught to be serviceable and make anything outside themselves - usually women - their ***Mental Point of Origin***. This manifests in their behaviors. That isn't to say that a man of a predominantly Alpha mindset can't deliberately display a Beta attribute to serve his ends. The same applies to Beta men showing Alpha attributes. This problem is **congruent** with the perception of that man's status to a woman.

In the case of the Australian guy who *Goldmund* AMOG'd, the woman already had a preconception of his Beta status. Had he displayed some brief "*flash of Alpha*," it would've seemed inauthentic and insecure '**bitch behavior**' because it would be inconsistent with his perceived status.

Going from an Alpha preconception to a brief "flash of Beta" can be endearing and affirming for a woman. That's the essence of the *Vulnerability Game*. A fleeting moment of vulnerability from a predominantly Alpha male personality is a Game force multiplier, but only when its display is rare.

There is no neutral balance of Alpha and Beta that a woman will ever find attractive in a man. His mindset and behaviors must be predominantly and consistently Alpha. This is the only reliable way to hold a woman's Hypergamous sexual and relational interests.

While expressions of Beta traits are necessary for comfort, there is no advantage in a man trying to maintain the equilateral balance of Alpha to Beta traits. If anything, it only serves to confuse a woman about her estimate of your status. Moments of *Vulnerability* can be reassuring for women, but only when that vulnerability is uncharacteristic

for a predominantly Alpha man. In other words, she's the only one who can draw them out of him. Think *Beauty and the Beast*.

Relational Equity

Beta men think their emotional, financial, and loyalty investments in a woman will be appreciated and reciprocated by the women they invest in. This presumption is integral to a mindset founded on the *old order's* social contract. Beta men's approach to intimacy expects a woman to appreciate his investing in her as a quality that sets him apart from "typical guys who just want to bang her." Goldmund's effortlessly seducing the woman that the Aussie Guy had invested so much in exposed two frustrating realities for him.

First, is the destruction of his ego-investment in his old books mindset. The second is a sense of loss of relational investment and time he was trying to figure out how to get a return on that investment. All of the preconditions he believed were necessary to get this woman's intimacy are tossed out of the window when *Goldmund* arrives, and she willingly, unconditionally, becomes sexual with him.

He believed he had to earn her sex. But in no uncertain terms, along comes a guy who did almost **nothing** to make it, and she reflexively responds to him with sex.

Women will break the rules for Alpha men while creating rules for Beta men to access their sexuality. To take this a step further, Beta men are preconditioned to impose those rules upon themselves before they ever meet a woman with whom to invest in.

The presumption of relational equity comes before a Beta even has a woman to invest in. This is the source of the Aussie guy's frustration. According to his ruleset, she should know this.

Giving Value

Here's some insight about what ought, or ought not, be a Red Pill-aware man's duty to his fellow, unenlightened Blue Pill man.

Ethical responsibilities in a red pill paradigm are an interesting concept for those not in it. If we all accept Red Pill principles like Hypergamy, AF/BB, and so on as truth (which most of us do, since we're here) and as you advance in Game, you see, know, and can do more with social and intergender dynamics than 99% of the men around you.

You can use this for destruction and mayhem. You can use this to selfishly get your needs met with zero fucks given about anyone. Or you can use it to get your needs met and provide value to the people you interact with. The question is, why should you? Aside from metaphysical reasons like religion, Karma, and so forth, the answer is that you can choose to believe or not: you mainly do it for yourself.

By fucking others up this way, you fuck yourself up. Is it possible to go down the route of destruction with zero fucks given about anyone and lead a happy, fulfilled life long term? Probably for some. More likely, you'll end up fucking yourself without purpose, unable to satisfy your raging narcissistic urges, burning out, and getting more and more shallow as you chase the next kick. Giving value makes you happier than taking value. It sounds like a cliché, but it's true if long-term happiness in life is your concern.

This speaks to dealing with Blue Pill men in a Red Pill-aware man's life. There is no exiting the game, so too is it next to impossible for the Red Pill-aware man to insulate himself from having to deal with, work with, relate to, men who are thoroughly invested in a Blue Pill defined

existence. Blue Pill orbiters are an untapped resource of social proof for a Red Pill-aware man.

All it takes to stand out in the crowd is to allow the mediocre to display their mediocrity and be ready to capitalize on it. It's like the part of Game where once you get to the attraction, all you have to do is not fuck things up. That's not to say Game doesn't take effort; it does, but when you have a connection with a woman who herself has orbiters' attention in spades, it's easy to see that her attraction cues and ego are built around quality, not quantity.

Sometimes AMOGing these guys can be counterproductive to good Game. Women may not want to bang their orbiters or hold them for anything more than easy attention, but they don't want anything too cruel to happen to them. Fortunately, there are "lightest touch" ways to use these guys' inability (or willful rejection) to embrace Red Pill awareness to your advantage.

There's a tendency to want to help these orbiters, but the real test has the confidence to use them as value multipliers. Adopting *Amused Mastery* with an orbiter is one such method - building social proof by artfully pointing out their *Beta Game* strategies. The risk you run is a woman taking this as arrogance on your part, at first, until that Beta confirms her impression of him.

Betas at Work

A difficult aspect of modern work life is cooperating with well-conditioned Blue Pill men. God forbid you'd have one as a business partner or a boss with whom your financial wellbeing depends. The workplace is the most dangerous environment attempting to "help" a Blue Pill man with Red Pill awareness. For all the talk of mythical "glass ceilings" and backroom boys clubs, modern corporate culture has been at the mercy of the Feminine Imperative's influence for several decades now.

This social environment was a *Male Space* invaded long ago by feminine-primary interests. Imagine a Blue Pill conditioned Beta who's been educated and acculturated in feminine primacy (as equality) for the better part of his lifetime. Now, take that guy and put him into a workplace social structure steeped in feminine-primary work laws, HR departments, and corporate bylaws (all designed to avoid charges of endemic workplace sexism).

Finally, if you base that man's livelihood, the health of his marriage, and the future wellbeing of his children on how well he adheres to that feminine-primary office culture, you get a guy who's a veritable time bomb for any Red Pill aware coworker.

The upside to this situation is that a Red Pill savvy man can use the predictability of how a Blue Pill colleague will respond to various workplace circumstances to his advantage.

While it may be prudent to accommodate that guy's Blue Pill mindset at work, it also presents some opportunities to use Red Pill awareness and Game in a context that can advance your career. Female bosses are still female. The same dynamics you can use to ping social proof from a Blue

Pill orbiter can similarly be used with a Blue Pill coworker and a female supervisor.

If you know a guy is trapped in a Blue Pill marriage, odds are he's in a dead bedroom situation. If he's got kids, especially a newborn, it's pretty easy to predict his life priorities based on what we know of his Blue Pill mindset. Happy wife, happy life is probably his ego-investment.

There's a lot you can read from a Blue Pill coworker or supervisor, and as a Red Pill-aware man, this puts you at a strategic advantage in the workplace. As such, you are not at the disadvantage he is. You can opt-in to work opportunities. His mindset and life's conditions won't permit him to.

Being Red Pill aware has various advantages in dealing with women in the workplace. In the same vein as the Blue Pill supervisor, it's essential to get a "read" on a female boss. How does she interact with male and female subordinates? Corporate culture is often the most visceral teacher in understanding intra-sexual competition amongst women.

As Red Pill-aware men, we can also apply our predictive Red Pill Lens towards what most women in the workplace are experiencing in their lives. We know the common dissatisfaction professional women experience regarding their personal lives. We also know that even the married ones are likely to be discontent with husbands whom they can never feel comfortable submitting themselves to - especially after 8-10 hours at an office where lesser men must submit to her.

The high-status men she is beholden to don't see her as anything but an instrument for their success. The trick is using this tactical understanding to your benefit by getting inside their heads and making female nature work for you.

After all this, we're left with a few considerations. The first is the degree of calculated risk a Red Pill man is comfortable taking with a Blue Pill colleague. Even if the

guy is a personal friend, there is always a risk that using your Red Pill Lens with him can backfire on you. There's only one thing worse than a woman scorned, and that's a deeply committed Blue Pill guy who's just had his mindset used against him by a superior player. Most will pass it off due to an *unfair life*, but others, the less stable Blue Pill guys, can have explosive potential.

Then there are the ever-present ethical considerations that will always dog this question – ***should you do it?***

If *Goldmund's* story is a lesson in mate poaching, it was also a lesson in ethical consideration. Much of what women find arousing in men is linked to Dark Triad personality traits – the polar opposite of Beta security traits. Sometimes Red Pill awareness and Game savvy get called “*an education in psychopathy.*”

Having written about Red Pill awareness for as long as I have, I know there's more to this. To the uninitiated, I understand why it looks like psychopathy. **There is a necessary self-importance a good Player must adopt to be effective.** That looks like psychopathy to a culture raised to put women above all other considerations, including self.

Does a Red Pill man use his awareness to his advantage outside of the intersexual realm? Using it with a female supervisor or family member might be an easy yes. But in the case of using a Blue Pill man's handicap in his mindset, that answer may be more difficult. Even if there is no malice involved, and even if just by having that awareness, a Red Pill man has a distinct advantage over men given to a Blue Pill belief set and their resultant life conditions.

The question might be, are we our Beta brother's keepers? Do we have an obligation to give Blue Pill men value, or does that idea end where that man's capacity to accept what Red Pill awareness offers him end? I have five books and a decade of blog posts, all written with the intent

of helping Blue Pill men and making them aware of the true nature of intersexual dynamism.

My purpose has always been to give men the tools to do that, but is it my obligation to do so? Only we can answer this ourselves.

THE OF ZEN GAME

I had just finished a good workout and was on my way home when my daughter texted asking if I would pick up a sandwich from *Subway* and bring it to her at school. I get into the local *Subway* at around 6:30 pm. It's a Friday night. *Subway* isn't the most happening place on a Friday, but I'm there with a couple ahead of me in line. The woman looked to be late 20's; I'd guess 27-28, and not too bad looking - 5' 9", blonde. She might rate a seven on the Tomassi scale.

The guy she's with was thin, short mop of hair, about the same height, maybe around her age. What made them notable was the gender dynamic between them I picked up on immediately. Within the first three minutes of coming up behind them, the guy had made every Beta Tell move that there's a term for. He was hugging up on her from behind, leaning in, and she stood there like a tree. His posture, body language, and attitude instantly told me this couple's relational dynamic - he was the qualifying Beta, and she was the mouthy, hard-to-please *Hyena*.

She noticed me when I came up. I was the only other person in *Subway*, and I still had my gym clothes on. Some top 40 crap song came on the overhead, and she blathered out, "*I hate this shit music. They should put Metallica or Slayer on, that would be funny!*" as if she expected the Beta to ask the management to switch stations.

She glances at me as if offering an opening after that comment. I order my daughter's sandwich. "*No! Don't get me lemonade; it's too syrupy here, get me to diet Dr. Pepper,*" she belts out to the Beta dutifully getting their drinks. The sandwich artist asks her what she'd like on her sandwich. She then reaches over and touches my forearm (IOI, kino). "*This might take a while; I'm very choosy,*" she throws the words at me in her "**tone.**"

"I'm not in a hurry," I say with a knowing smirk.

Sandwiches get made, Beta pays. My daughter's sandwich is done simultaneously. As Boss Girl and Beta Boy are about to leave, she grabs both their sandwiches and mine "by mistake." The *Subway* cashier stops her to tell her she picked up my sandwich (we're the only people in the store); Beta puffs a nervous laugh, she looks at me, *"Ohh, sorry..."* hands me the bag and holds eye contact just that beat longer than expected. *"Come on; we gotta go"* Beta reaches around her waist, and like a cane that pulls a bad actor off the stage, they exit.

Passive Game

I did nothing to actively Game this girl; she was Gaming herself. I've seen this before. Sometimes girls will Game themselves, and all you need to do is not fuck it up. Sometimes less **is** more. When a woman is already attracted to you, Game shifts to becoming an effort in remaining aware of the indicators. Allow the proper **flow** and **presume the sale**.

Being married puts a man in a "*nothing to lose*" perspective. Guys think a wedding ring makes a man more desirable - it doesn't. If married men are attractive to single women, it's not due to some fantasy of mate poaching or his vows that make him more attractive as a long-term prospect. It's because, generally, he's not actively pursuing women.

There's an almost God-like power in indifference - you're *far* more desirable when you aren't qualifying yourself to women. And no guy is more indifferent to women than one who knows with all certainty who he'll be banging that evening. It's also why guys who *spin plates* unconsciously manifest confidence behaviors. Boldly experimenting with Game is a lot easier when you know you have other irons in the fire.

However, there is also an amplification of attraction (and arousal) for Alpha men when a woman is in a relationship with a man she sees as predominantly Beta. A similar amplification results when a woman is the focus of one or more Beta orbiters. The supplication of lesser men puts an Alpha in the spotlight. Consistent Beta *simping* amplifies women's preselection effect for Alpha men.

Beta men universally adopt the role of **emotional tampon** for women. They're "good listeners." They eagerly commiserate with her about the 'asshole boyfriend,' only to

have her desire for the Jerk become more amplified, and off she goes for the sex she genuinely desires with him again. Beta orbiters, or ***Simps*** if you prefer, actually reinforce that Alpha Jerk as a source of FOMO for her – the ***Fear of Missing Out***. Average men tend to gaslight themselves. They call this cycle of attraction “a moment of weakness” for a *special girl*, but they’re oblivious to how their affirmations contribute to her interest in that Alpha.

It wouldn’t take much Game to poach the *Subway* girl. The Beta boyfriend had done the heavy lifting for me. I didn’t even need formal Game to understand the dynamic going on. In my *Rock Star* 20s, I’d poached many a Simp’s girlfriend. It was always easy pickings because the girls were already half-primed to be poached.

I never pulled a girl who didn’t already want to be poached. When you see it often enough, you’ll come to understand the Game *flow* of women in this circumstance. That may sound mercenary –you’re technically *swooping* a girl from another guy who’s invested effort in her – but it teaches a lesson in Game; sometimes, all you need to do is get past the sticking point that is *you*.

This dynamic is something to remember if you’re Gaming a girl with a boyfriend or a girl who drops a ***boyfriend disclaimer*** into casual conversation. Her boyfriend may not be the Beta this guy was, but if he is, let that form the basis of your Game. Let the “**Beta do the heavy lifting.**” This dynamic is also the root of AMOGing and running boyfriend destroyer Game. You may never feel comfortable running this Game. That’s fine, but you must know when this tactic is being run on you.

Husband = Beta

Before you think I've gone entirely mercenary, I'll add this:

"She married you because you are a provider, not because she was attracted to you. She'll never be as attracted to you as she was to her previous Alpha Fucks."

That's a tough pill to swallow my brother. The issue being, of course, what to do with yourself and with her, *after* you discover you got gamed into that kind of marriage.

Here's a tougher pill to swallow; she'll never be as attracted to you as she is of the guy's she sees as Alpha after you're married too. What the guy in *Subway* made me think of was wondering if he had of, at one time, been relatively Alpha enough to attract this *Boss Girl*, or if she perceived him in a good provider role?

She certainly fit the profile of the 28-29-year-old woman in the ***Epiphany Phase*** looking to cash out of the sexual marketplace before her attractiveness expires. On the other hand, she wasn't opposed to giving a (perceived) Alpha overt IOIs right there in front of him. It's an interesting passive cuckolding effect.

Does an Alpha inherently drop in status for a woman once he's committed to monogamy with her?

A situation I'm asked to analyze from Red Pill men is this: After a few years, they find themselves trapped in a sexless marriage or living arrangement, and they want to know how to get back to the ***hot monkey sex*** they had (or their wives had with previous lovers) in the early stages of their relationship. Once they become Red Pill/Game aware, they realize what they are and how they got there.

The next question is, how do they get back to what he had before? The question is usually along the lines of “***Help Rollo, I used to be Alpha back in the day, but now my wife sees me as a Beta provider; what do I do?***” Virtually every man on the old *Married Man Sex Life* forum was looking for a solution to this. But is it marriage itself? Doesn’t monogamy predispose a woman to view her familiar husband in a Beta light? Only Beta men *need* to commit to fulfilling a woman’s sexual strategy. The go-to definition is Beta ***Provider***, not Alpha ***Provider***.

If a woman is a judge, she will pair off with him long-term and has agreed to a commitment with a man; it would follow that she believes this man will be a provider and parent for her and their future children. It’s less about a man backsliding into Beta status and more about familiarity and provisioning-performance defining marriage that makes a woman consider him a Beta-provider by default.

Dr. Warren Farrell explored this in some of his writing. The familiarity of marriage predisposes women to see their husbands as family members. The idea of sex with a family member is innately repelling for women. This is further complicated by parenthood when the boyfriend becomes the husband, and then the husband becomes *Daddy*. The family familiarity dynamic makes having sex less and less appealing for her.

Once she’s had children, sex becomes a behavioral reinforcer that keeps the man parentally invested in her and the kids. However, in today’s Gynocentric social order, where the Beta Bucks side of Hypergamy is more or less insured for women, the idea of *Duty Sex* is conflated with marital rape. The complex only worsens when combined with a fattening and less sexually appealing Daddy and Mommy. Thus, ***any*** extramarital Alpha becomes the stuff of fantasy for women.

After the marriage, sometimes just a few short years, we hear of the sexless husband, fully Betatized, *begging* for

sex. But, based on his previous experience with the woman, what *should* he have been looking for to tip him off? My question is pointed more towards the men who are Alpha who get duped:

"What's wrong with these guys, Rollo? They should've seen these Red Flags before they wifed her up!"

Average men are blind to the *Red Flags* telegraphed by women. They *must* protect their ego-investments in their beliefs about how men and women *should* be attracted to each other. This sounds counterintuitive, but it's in their reproductive interests to ignore, and rationalize away, the *Red Flags* that their instincts are alerting them to. Why?

Because, acknowledging and acting on those *Red Flags* impede his reproducing. Evolution doesn't care *how* babies are born; it only cares *that* they are born. If ignoring obvious warning signs, and adopting memes that justify ignoring them, leads to reproduction, that's all that matters. The more a man lacks sexual opportunities, the more likely he will ignore *Red Flags* in women.

The Red Flags You Don't Want to See

A lot gets made of women's **Red Flags** in the Manosphere. *Breakup with Her if she displays these Seven Warning Signs* is a staple of Manosphere *YouTubers*. Usually, they presume a guy is considering a relationship with a girl, and he better watch out for things like an obsession with *Instagram* or she has more male friends than female friends.

But, the "*Griftosphere*" always fields the softball *Red Flags*. They cut and paste the same inane *red flags* to watch from one post or video to another. But it's the less obvious ones that are potentially more damaging to a guy's life – especially if he's already conditioned to ignore them. So, what should a guy be looking for?

1. A guy should take note of the kinds and types of men a woman was attracted to/fucked before. It's not a that a girl has many male admirers – they all do – it's the kind of guy she entertains. It's a huge *Red Flag* if **you** are markedly different from those kinds of men. For example, she used to date guys in shitty bands and minor league athletes. But she's now taken quite a shine to mid-level business managers and guys with steady jobs. This indicates she's in her *Epiphany Phase*, changing lanes and going for Beta Bucks. This woman is for dating, not for marriage.
2. She was a slut with other guys but made you wait. Then when she finally does take the plunge, the sex is of pornstar quality, but she seems to be putting on an act, like a performer on stage. This is the **Bait & Switch** girl. Average men are

particularly susceptible to this if they subscribe to the soulmate myth.

3. She has an entitlement mentality surrounding sex. To her, sex is a commodity that she uses as a currency for exchange. She expects something in return for giving you sex. Sexual access is a reward for following the *rules* she makes or exhibiting desired behavior and performance. Men who've only experienced *transactional sex* will readily overlook this *Red Flag* because they align with the sex-as-reward mentality. Women like this try to be subtle in communicating their *rules*, but their words always center on how men *should* accept the correct ideology that sex is a *gift* she gives to him for services rendered.
4. She firmly controls the sex. She won't do certain things. She will have sex only at certain times; doesn't like certain sexual acts because "*only sluts do that*" and "*I don't want you to think I'm a slut*". Immediately gets up after sex to expel the semen because "*I don't want to get a yeast infection*" or to take care of the wet spot. This is any woman preoccupied with external things instead of being absorbed in enjoying sex with you – primarily because she *doesn't* enjoy sex with a man who doesn't *get* that she isn't into him but is obligated to fuck him for some reason.
5. Closely related to this is that she remains in control during sex. She's self-conscious and never seems to be completely free or enjoying herself. She's constantly assessing her performance and your evaluation of her sexually. She doesn't like fucking in hotels with long mirrors. **Obsessive self-consciousness in anything sexual with a woman is a major *Red Flag*.**

6. She wants to rush to commitment. She puts out overt and subtle hints that she expects ever-increasing investment and commitment in exchange for the sex perks she's doling out. This is the ***free samples, loss-leader*** girl. Initially, she's very sexual, but within a week or two, she's decided for moral reasons she shouldn't have sex with you anymore, and her fucking you last week was a lapse in judgment on her part. This is another major *Red Flag*. Guys who accept this post-sex morality disclaimer set the weakest *Frame* possible for their future marriages to these women.

All these are tells of a woman looking to cash out of the sexual marketplace with a provider in her *Epiphany Phase* (29 - 31-years-old). Average men are so grateful for sexual access they'll *actively gaslight themselves* about these *Red Flags*. They rationalize and overlook indiscretions that they'll only acknowledge later when the divorce papers are signed.

So, how do you avoid your own self-deception about women's *Red Flags*?

Always remember the *Red Pill Prime Directive*:

Women Break Rules for Alphas and Make Rules for Betas.

If you're wondering about *Red Flags* with any woman, always defer to this maxim. Is she making or tacitly enforcing ***any*** rules for you to get sexual access? She likely perceives you as predominantly Beta. A woman making rules for sexual access is always a negotiation of desire. In this case, she's negotiating desire with herself. Later it

becomes a transaction and an obligation she'll come to resent.

Next, is she breaking her rules to have sex with you? Is she willfully, enthusiastically, going out of her way to arrange to see and please you? Is she risking personal costs to have sex with you? Is she acting *out of character* to accommodate compatibility with you? Does she take an enthusiastic interest in finding out what you like, what music you're into, what sports teams you're a fan of, etc.? She likely sees you as Alpha; don't screw up that perception for her.

There's a parallel dynamic in most primates. For Alpha male primates, females eagerly seek out sex with him. She pays *him* with bananas and grooming. For the Beta males of the troop, females require servicing from the male. An exchange of services or resources from him (bananas, grooming, and *babysitting*) is the transaction – and only during the luteal phase of her menstrual cycle (point of lowest potential for fertility).

When she is in the proliferative phase of her menstrual cycle (pre-ovulation, highest potential of fertility), she shuns the Beta males; aggressively fighting them away, while she seeks out the sexual attentions of the dominant Alpha male. This is Hypergamy in its most Darwinian state. Women's sexuality is nothing if not pragmatic and opportunistic.

When I get the question, "*How do I get my wife to fuck me again?*" it's coming from a man who thought he had the best his wife had to offer; sexually, emotionally, etc. Only later does he discover she had, or still has, the potential to be much more sexual than **he** can coax from her. She's just unwilling to give it to *him*.

Does his being her husband make her impression of him Beta by default? There's a concept that *only* Beta men would ever *consider* marriage. The openness to marriage is a behavioral cue of Beta male status. Beta Tells defines the

beliefs, behaviors, and attitudes of qualifying for a long-term commitment.

Only men with few sexual opportunities (Betas) would be eager to *settle down* to solve their reproductive problem. When a man shows a willingness to obey the rules made for him by a woman to get to this state of commitment, he becomes *Boyfriend Material* or *Husband Material*. Just the interest in a long-term relationship disqualifies him from Alpha status.

That's the theory, and it certainly has merit, but this may be putting the cart before the horse. Does his *Betatization* occur before or after his commitment to monogamy? It is possible a man cannot help but be perceived as a Beta by his wife because he is her husband, a parent, and a provider. He's family now, and the sex becomes something slowly drip-fed to him because she's not into him anymore.

Guys follow up their pre-marriage ignoring of *Red Flags* by gaslighting themselves about how all women become "less sexual" after marriage and kids. Divorced men later express disbelief after discovering just how wildly sexual their ex-wives are with new lovers. They take it as a personal failing that they could not bring out the slut in their wives when married. I'd argue that their familiarity as husband and father made this nearly impossible for them – mainly because of their Blue Pill belief sets.

There's a lot more I could write about this. What do you do if you find yourself in this situation? Leave? Divorce? Cheat on her? Remember, women don't want a man to cheat even in marriage, but they love a man who **could** cheat – even in marriage. That imagination *can* be enough to push past that comfortable familiarity.

I can think of one mommy-blogger whose husband cheated on her, resulting in her unconditional submission. *Dread Game*, overt or *soft* dread, might cut through that familiarity.

Strong *Frame* control is always the lynchpin to a good relationship. Ensuring that your SMV is above that of your wife/girlfriend, and knowing the power this has, can keep an Alpha impression intact. Internalizing Red Pill awareness and understanding Game is necessary to the health of any marriage or long-term relationship. Understanding this is more necessary than when you're single. The risks in modern marriage are so one-sided for men that the margin for error in not being Red Pill aware makes the investment untenable.

In the end, you'll have to evaluate the effort of changing yourself to reestablish that Alpha sex connection. If divorce isn't an option for you due to religious convictions, you'll have to factor that into your evaluation too. If not, then you'll have to consider the depth and importance your commitment means to you versus the effort you'll make to reestablish yourself.

You'll need to consider this with all the logic and rationalism at your disposal, divorced from emotional considerations – most times, that's the most challenging part. You'll want to couch your decision-making process based on Blue Pill hope, but ultimately, you have to set aside that emotionalism and use cold pragmatism.

DIRECT VS. INDIRECT GAME

Every Game strategy I've detailed so far has been relative to what's known as *Indirect Game*. This is what most understand as formal Game. It's a predictive framework of techniques, approaches, and behaviors based on one premise: ***Women would rather play the game than have the game explained to them.***

Whether your dating coach guru acknowledges it or not, the essence of Game lies in the Observer Effect. Observing a process will change that process. In Game terms, this means it is more effective to learn and master the ***process*** of intersexual dynamics and operate from within that process.

Game seems disingenuous because a good Player knows the process (women's nature, intersexual dynamics), yet he's still *playing* along in a Game he's mastered. He knows the code in the Matrix but masters the Game that ***is*** the Matrix.

Few men have the patience or the art to master the system entirely. It would be much simpler if you could drop all the pretense and bullshit with women and get to the point - "are you down to fuck or not?" We could all save a lot of effort, time, money, and hurt feelings if women communicated like men and gave them a direct answer.

But, women are not like men, and no man has ever *reasoned* a woman into bed with him. Combining this directness with appeals to authentic masculinity, we get what's called ***Direct Game***.

Direct Game is a bit of a misnomer. The *game* aspect is essentially what it's always tried to avoid. "Blunt Force Game" might be more apt. It appeals to guys who never learn *formal Game* because it seems more pragmatic than years spent learning the system for minimal reward. Just ask her if she's into fucking you?

If you're more traditional-minded, be *upfront* in your intent to "court" her like you think your great grandfather did with your grandma. It's easy to get romanced by the nostalgia factor of direct Game. Guys read stories about men who've succeeded by being "upfront with a woman" about his intent and believe it's the '*Real Man*' path to getting a *Quality Woman*. It's more pragmatic, *and* it's the "right thing to do."

Direct Game has its uses. It **can** work in certain situations, but if you're a guy who has little natural ability or needs *aftermarket* Game to get laid, you'll have a higher success rate with Indirect Game. This is the *Mystery* effect I mentioned in *Breadcrumbs* and *The Flow* chapters.

By definition, Direct Game destroys the intrigue a woman might have about you. Going direct is anti-seductive in that it kills the emotional associations and imagination women need to "*figure you out*" from the very beginning.

Before we go further, let's dispel a myth here first; Direct Game is not just **Mode One** style, in your face, sexual propositions. Real Direct Game openers are far more benign.

"Hi, I saw you from over there. You seem pretty interesting. What's your name?"

"Hi, I don't have a lot of time to talk, but you seem like someone I'd like to get to know. Do you want to meet sometime for coffee?"

Basic, no-brainer opens that telegraph direct interest. For reference, these are indirect openers:

"Is it okay if I pretend I'm talking to you? There's this girl over there who won't leave me alone. I'm hoping she'll see me with you and get the hint. Feel free to

touch me lightly on the shoulder to make this more believable. Hi, I'm Brandon; what's your name?"

"Do you speak English? What does this word here on the menu mean? I wish I had a dictionary on my phone. Have you used this thing before? Is it any good?"

Direct Game doesn't mean you go Beta, give her compliments or buy her drinks. Direct Game doesn't *simp* for a girl. It doesn't reference her beauty, but it does set up an implied challenge that your interest depends on her being a cool person when delivered correctly. *Frame* and pre-qualification are still part of Direct Game. I should also add that *Command Presence* is vital to Direct Game.

Advocates say Direct Game is better, but it's always been a subjective difference depending on looks, skill, and wit. Their conclusions are usually based only on personal experience. A problem with Direct Game is it telegraphs intent from the beginning. It forces the girl to decide before building up any value other than your appearance and confidence.

Appearance may be the only criteria in online dating, but it's not enough for women when you meet them in real-time. In its purest sense, Direct Game can **only** be applied in real-time. The disadvantage is not giving her the time and information she needs to weigh the pros and cons of dating/sleeping with you. After you open, you force her to decide if she wants to get involved immediately.

Most women bow out with a *boyfriend disclaimer*, or they'll be *nice* to you for attention. While their confidence is appreciated, Direct Game guys have meager close rates. In the early days of Pickup Direct Game was the tactic of PUAs who were tired of formulaic Game routines. They

wanted a more expedited form of Game, not the monotonous, labor-intensive **play** with her Game.

In contrast, today's idea of *going direct* is based on a moralistic, "stop being a little bitch", be an authentic man appeal. It's anti-Game game. As such, being direct has lost all of its previous Game-applicable nuances.

Now, let's say you're a *natural* who's been getting laid since you were 15. Girls gravitate to you due to your above-average looks and demeanor. Going direct may be your *only* form of Game. If it isn't broke, what's to fix? In fact, for good-looking guys with limited social skills, going indirect would actually handicap them. Most *naturals* need to get down to business before a girl realizes there isn't much to him.

The more value you have, in terms of looks, status, and prestige, the more direct you can go. Direct Game is the most logical extension for guys who can approach girls, say they're beautiful, and get a lay that night.

Average men need to study Game to get the girl they want. Average men don't have that initial value to be rewarded for a direct opener. Some environments and circumstances are more amenable to Direct Game. Usually, these are high head-count places like concerts or loud clubs where formal Game is challenging to run.

Suppose you're not getting IOIs in a club, approach with Indirect Game. If your energy level is high, and you feel like a rock star, then go with that energy and use Direct Game. For new Players, this type of scenario won't happen until you're more confident.

Game Maxim #13: *Some girls will reject your Direct Game, who would have eventually fucked you had you gone indirect.*

This never works the other way around. If you approach a girl indirectly that you could have gone direct on, the only difference is it takes longer. For this reason alone, it's simply better to develop Indirect Game first and then consider adding Direct approaches. You don't have to choose one or the other as your strategy. Direct Game can be fun as a Game tool, but it's no substitute for indirect Game. For average-looking guys, formal Game is your best option to start with.

Important Note: “*Why not simply use a combined approach? Take the best of both approaches and create a personalized hybrid of Direct and Indirect.*”

The worst thing you can do is combine Direct with Indirect Game on the same girl.

A combined approach telegraphs incongruence to a woman. When guys have attempted to combine methods, they are indirect with their words but are very direct with their body language – mainly eye contact and body orientation. Each approach betrays the authenticity of the other. This screams incongruence to the girl who's already wary of the *creep* vibe.

When you're direct, it shows balls. The drawback is you're betraying a lot of interest. This lowers your value and makes you seem less of a mystery/challenge. But when you combine an indirect verbal opener with direct body language, you betray interest but don't show any balls at all!

Once you're in the interaction with her, you can start to show more interest physically once she's earned it. You can be more sexual with your eye contact, etc. But if you're going to open indirect, then be indirect. Don't betray too much interest. Act like she just happened to be there and thought you'd say something to her. If you're going to walk across a room to talk to her, then show some balls. Go direct. Whatever you do, do not combine approaches.

Mixing Signals

That said, mixing your signals (i.e., obfuscating your intentions) is a powerful technique to arouse interest in women. In the *Looks, Money, Status* hierarchy, signal mixing is based on women's attraction to status.

Men's status signals can be categorized into **body language** and **verbal communication**. Conspicuous consumption signals of status (an expensive Rolex, clothing, or "owning" a McLaren) can be faked, but the psychological manifestations of status are more difficult to ape.

Body language includes a host of nonverbal mannerisms. The way a man walks, his dress, his facial expressions, how he moves his limbs, and even how he stands or holds a glass are indicators of congruence. Verbal communication is the words that come out of a man's mouth and how he says them that indicate value.

Average men tend to focus on the words they say. This is because the impact of a man's body language on women's senses is poorly understood. Physicality is intangible. It's only relative to the effect he thinks his words carry.

Body language is relegated to acting in concert with subconscious feelings of self-worth; for this reason, body language can be a man's worst enemy if he's isn't aware of how his mannerisms betray his personal state.

Verbal communication is overrated, and men underrate body language. I'll explain this more in the chapter on *Body Language*, but the upshot here is that men can back off the pressure to say the right things. If you work to adjust your body language, it does most of your talking.

Mixing *signals* is the art of telling/showing a woman one thing while showing/telling her another.

So, how does this apply to Direct vs. Indirect Game? There are four permutations of body language and speech possible when approaching women, only two of which involve mixed signals.

1. Direct Body Language (DBL) + Direct Verbal Communication (DVC)

You make a bold statement of intention with your body motions and words.

Example: Walking slowly toward a woman, holding eye contact the whole way, stopping in front of her, *pausing for effect*, and with a low, deliberate tone of voice, saying, “*I’d regret it if I didn’t find out if you are the kind of woman I’d want to get to know.*”

2. Indirect Body Language (IBL) + Indirect Verbal Communication (IVC)

You engage her with an innocuous statement about something in your shared environment. You comport yourself like you have another place to be, and she happens to be there to listen to you.

Example: Look over your shoulder at the girl. Turn your body to face her partially—point one foot in another direction. Rock back on your heels as you speak. A glance at some distant object. With a neutral tone of voice, say, “*If the bookstore weren’t so full of poseurs, we might have a chance to get a book within the next hour.*” The key to this is a visual connection from her to you.

3. DBL + IVC

Make a bold statement of intent with your body and facial expressions while speaking neutrally to suggest you are not interested in hitting on her.

Example: Directly face her, positioning, so that eye contact is unavoidable, non-threateningly occupy her personal space, ask in a bland tone of voice, after a pause, if she can direct you to the nearest toy shop so you can buy a gift for your niece (or something innocuous to that effect).

4. IBL + DVC

Verbally communicate your interest while your body language bespeaks disinterest.

Example: Body rocking, feet positioned as if you are about to walk off, approaching at an angle with shoulders turned halfway outward, eyes surveying your environment, open her directly with a vibe that belies your mannerisms.

Which of these styles of interaction is best? That's hard to say because the technique that works best depends in some measure on the skill of the Player. A sexually needy man, who experiences bouts of nerves when cute girls are near, stands a good chance of being perceived as incongruent in his words and behavior if he tries to directly open a girl while comporting himself as if he's too cool to be there.

Similarly, an experienced Player, with rock-solid confident body language who masks his intentions under a flurry of misdirection will strike a girl as a coward who's too skittish to say what's on his mind. Both situations have a high *creep* detection probability.

However, contextual problems aside, this is a valuable illustration of different approach styles' effectiveness and incongruence. I can already hear the moans of, "*Oh Lord, that line would never work on a girl!*"

The above examples are not routines or templates for Game routines you should experiment with. They are outlines of Direct and Indirect approaches to Game. The inconsistencies in these approaches are why most new Players fail horribly with women.

What most guys do when they attempt to be indirect is they're indirect with their words ("*How do you get to Starbucks?*"), but they are very direct with their body language – mainly eye contact and body orientation. They face her, give her lots of eye contact and look at her continuously as if they've just spotted a rare bird. Instead of combining the best of both worlds, this combines the worst.

The DBL + IVC style is the riskiest strategy for an average man to pull off. It's too easy to come across like a suave dude who can't go the extra distance and ask the girl out. Many good-looking guys have this problem, but their looks give them a pass in that women will interpret that insecurity as sweet coyness.

Any situation that calls for a direct approach — walking across a large room in full view of your target who knows you're moving in on her — would benefit from a Direct style verbal opener. You can go indirect in these circumstances, but you'd better be a master of the **read** of women's expectations, so your value remains high. Mixing signals always comes with the risk of being incongruent in perception and expectation.

Men new to Game are better off learning and employing the IBL + IVC style. This is what most pickup artists teach their students. Women typically prefer the indirect approach from the typical man. An inexperienced man will not possess the degree of self-amused state control required to pull off direct methods. New Players need gradual indicators of interest from women to build confidence levels to where they're comfortable risking direct openers and sub-communicating sexual interest.

An indirect approach also allows a new Player to gauge better a woman's "**buying temperature**" in real-time. **Buying Temperature** is a term borrowed from salesmen. It's a feel for a customer's emotional state to buy something they're selling. Usually, this is something expensive that requires seduction techniques on the salesman's part to influence their contemplation and decision to buy.

The best salesmen have an instinctual understanding of their customer's emotional state, but the masters of sales know the ***Zen of the sale: Leading the buyer to presume she is the one selling herself on the purchase.*** Assessing Buying Temperature in seduction, as

in sales, takes accuracy in your *read* and finesse in Game – and this takes time. The time you deliberately deprive yourself of by going direct.

Pragmatically speaking, IBL + IVC is optimal for younger men and less experienced men. Once a Player develops some skill in this mode, he can experiment with direct strategies. IBL + DVC strategy can be one of the best approach techniques if used skillfully. Such a man is perceived as having the conviction of his words (Direct) but also signals that his interest level is waning, or he's hard to keep engaged.

In-your-face, arrogant, Naturals adopt this style. It's a classic archetype of the devil-may-care bad boy who speaks of lustful things to a girl while his eyes wander around the room, scanning for fresh meat. Very Dark Triad, very "*Sigma Male*," but it requires genuine authenticity and conviction to pull off. Being incongruent comes at a higher cost if you can't back up the perception.

Generally, though, mixing signals is a technique best left for experts. The risk of mood-killing incongruence is very high. Too many enthusiastic men mess it up when they couldn't sufficiently manage the bullshit between their words and mannerisms. Once a certain level of inner confidence is achieved, it doesn't matter what kind of approach style a man uses. Old school seduction used to think you needed solid indirect openers to open. Then they found out you could go direct.

Technically you can open with anything, so long as what you open with comes from a place of self-amusement and congruency. When you think, "***How should I open this girl?***" you're essentially thinking, "*What can I say to earn this girl's validation?*" You're already beginning in a *Frame* of having a lower value than her.

When you think, "*Whatever I say is gold, of course, she'll love me, I'm so awesome!*" you're psychologically screening her for "*Is she cool enough for me to let her hang*

with me?" You're already in a Frame of having a higher value than her. Women pick up on this subconsciously. They've spent their lives having to learn to assess quickly "is this person being genuine with me, or are they trying to get something from me?"

Direct Game developed because the guys who tried it were sick of going indirect and beating around the bush and wanted to get their intentions out in the open. They didn't expect it to work, but they found it did situationally. Does that contradict the idea that indirect, innocuous openers are best? Again, situationally it might. But remember, average men have no concept of formal Game, don't know indirect from direct, and likely wouldn't understand the concept of congruence if you whacked them over the head with it.

Women are accustomed to the behavior of the average, no-game man. In that context, indirect is still the best approach. Since that context is most contexts, it is good advice to follow for most men. Men exposed to a new way of thinking about women and seduction are better equipped to pursue different approach strategies of formalized Game that streamline the process and maximize success.

Game Break - How would you Open?

If you follow me on Twitter, you'll occasionally see me post a "*How would you open?*" tweet. I drop a picture of a woman in the tweet and ask my followers how they'd open her. Other *Game* accounts have taken up this habit, too, embellishing the image with some imagined specifics about time, place, and circumstance.

Twitter being Twitter, guys usually fire back with how they're too cool or respect themselves too much ever to approach a girl like that. "**I wouldn't waste my time on such a slovenly trull, really Rollo, I question your judgment!**" or something like that. Other guys just make jokes or memes about "*How would you open?*" but there is a method to the madness here.

In the heady days of the 2000s seduction community, "*How would you open?*" was an honest-to-goodness *Game* practice. The idea was simple; rack your brain to find an opener/approach for a woman you may or may not have any real attraction for. Maybe your *type* is the clean-cut, conservative-looking, sunhat-wearing *good girl*. Playing to your strengths, your *Game* will probably get locked into specializing in that one type of girl. Opening a tattooed Goth girl at a club would likely be out of your *domain*, but that's the point.

The source of true wit is imagination and improvisation – and that takes practice. If you feel like your social intelligence hobbles you, it's usually because you're too literal-minded or don't see any point in thinking outside the box. The point of "*How would you open?*" is an exercise in creativity. No one expects you to fuck the Goth girl (unless that's your thing), but I do expect you to know *how* to open her.

Even if it's ridiculous, the mental exercise of racking your brain for what to say to women you'd never approach will help you develop the quick wit and parry/riposte conversation skill you will need with women you are attracted to. "*How would you open?*" helps break you out of the domain dependency that limits your social skills with the type of women you *would* like to bang.

Anyway, give it a try, "*How would you open?*" is kind of fun. It's okay to be wrong or goof on it. It's a test of your *reading* skills combined with creative responses for that read.

PEACOCKING

Today's generation suffers from two debilitating social problems. Their attention spans are measurably shorter than any prior generation, and most have a brain programmed for binary literalism.

This is the TL;DR Generation (Too Long; Didn't Read). It wants instant gratification and proven results. Make your claim or get to the point of your "advice" in less than 13 seconds; it's the average time a viewer spends on *Instagram Reels*, *TikTok Videos*, or *YouTube #Shorts* before their hindbrain *buys* or *rejects* the content.

Average viewers won't bother watching the preview mouseover. They surmise the content they presume it's about from the thumbnail, title, and the first four comments. The latter half of *Millennials* and all of *GenZ* are habituated to a rapid information stream. Anything longer than a 12 minute *YouTube* video is quickly replaced by the algorithm's following video.

So, the idea that the investment of time and practice necessary to learn the social skills of Game seems like a big scam run by Chad Gurus, who want you to keep renting their content. If you're not selling me a rapid, clinically proven, one-step method to make me *Alpha as Fuck*, you must be a con artist preying on the insecurities of poor *OnlyFans*-addicted *Incels*. The *YouTube Algorithm* is engineered to be a *Churn*, so guys offering anything substantive are dismissed as charlatans before the first 45 seconds of a clip.

In these times, you can't blame a guy who's been desperate for intimacy for so long to want to follow some prescribed program that will only solve his most immediate problem. "*Okay, what do I hafta do to get the girls? Wear this? Say this? Act like so?...*" This type of literalist, binary

mindset makes most Beta men skeptical of the proponents of Game, and thus the validity of Game itself.

It's simpler to give up or rationalize their failings by reducing what they can accept of Red Pill awareness to *Looks, Money, and Status*. The *Looks* part is always the one that resonates best. At this writing, fully 75% of the American population is overweight. Roughly 40% are *morbidly obese*. Trust me, *Looks, Style, and Status* are where most men will start their dark journey to self-absorbed *Black Pill* nihilism.

The Peacock's Tail

In the early 2000s, the seduction community came across the concept of Peacocking. The PUA *Mystery* was a pioneer in this art. The modern-day caricature of a PUA that **every** hater of the Red Pill has is the mental image of *Mystery* in his elevator boots, fuzzy black boa, a top hat, black nail polish, and shirt with a red LED message board on it (no lie, Google it). These were the heady days of infield experimentation on *Alt.Fast.Seduction* the *Venusian Arts* forums and *SoSuave*. The application seemed ridiculous, but the psychological principles of *standing out from the crowd* are ancient and universal.

To grasp the Game concept of Peacocking, we have to look at why it's even called *Peacocking*. Consider the majestic male peacock. He struts out proudly, shakes a bit, and fans his regal tail feathers before his prospective mate. By comparison, the female peahen is a drab and generic brown. The peacock shakes and opens his glorious plumage, and if it's impressive enough, the female gets hot for it.

The peacock isn't the only animal that struts its colors, plumage, the mating dance, or big red ass to be sexually selected. However, a general rule in the animal kingdom is this: the sex with the highest reproduction cost usually chooses. Ergo, our peahen can be a picky Plain Jane because, after the sex, most peacocks won't be sticking around long to help raise the peachicks. But why is it the peacock's tail that gets the peahen all worked up? The short answer: verified survivability.

The consensus among evolutionary psychologists is the peacock's tail is a signal of good genetics that's impossible to fake. It's also a **costly** signal. Hauling around all that unwieldy tail plumage makes the peacock vulnerable to

predators and combating less endowed peacock rivals. Only a peacock of superior strength, constitution, and cleverness could afford to possess such a fabulous array of feathers.

That massive fan of feathers signals to the peahen, ***“Hey, look, I’m such a badass that I can carry this rack of feathers around and take on all comers. Mate with me, and we’ll produce some badass peachicks.”***

This is the basis of what’s known as the *Sexy Sons* theory of female sexual selection. Reproducing with the best genetic specimen ensures the peahen’s genes will better survive in her offspring.

Now, reproduction is the ultimate purpose, but the proximate cause, the immediate effect, is that the peacock’s tail feathers get her warmed up for mating. Whether it’s a mating song, a dance, or the flaring of a colorful throat-sack, the vast majority of all animals have some costly signaling that works similarly to the peacock’s tail.

Human beings are no different in these displays of mating suitability. An expensive watch, a Lamborghini, and an Armani suit are signs of status, but the conspicuous consumption they represent is the peacock’s tail. There is one difference worth pointing out, though; human females make great efforts in being selected for mating consideration from high-value males. This is primarily due to reproductive investment being shared by both sexes.

Women still bear the lion’s share of that investment because women and infants are uniquely vulnerable in the reproductive equation. Men have to share in the investment of (hopefully their own) offspring. **Human beings are the apex species on this planet because human males evolved innate instincts to protect, provide for, and parentally invest in their mates and children.** As such, women make efforts to attract the highest value mates.

That said, it’s still men whose quality is measured by the male *Burden of Performance*. Women have evolved

sensitivities necessary to evaluate men's performance as discreetly as possible.

Are there parallels to the peacock's tail in men? Absolutely. Most of the choices men make in life that mold their personalities, beliefs, and careers are centered on the costly signals that will attract a mate. Contrary to the *Black Pill* notions of *Jester-maxing* and MGTOWs' *Dancing Monkeys*, men's evolved mental firmware predisposes them to perform for women in various ways.

Men's mating *performances* are a feature, not a bug, of our evolution. From the clothes we wear to the physiques we cultivate to how we earn a living, sexual selection, and intra-sexual competition are the latent purposes of what we do. Accepting this reality, and leveraging it to our advantage, is a critical element of Game.

Imagine for a moment that you're a peacock. You have a magnificent spread of feathers, more glorious than any of your other peacock friends. But your lesser-endowed peacock bros tell you, "Dude, why do you feel the need to spread your tail? What are you compensating for? Do you think that makes you more of a *real* peacock? Stop trying to be something you're not! *Real* peacocks don't spread and shake for peahens; they have more integrity than that.

The spread ain't worth the Peahen, bro." The funny thing is, every time you spread your feathers, the peahens throw themselves at you. Memes like this are adaptive intra-sexual competition among sexual rivals.

When men cannot compete with a sexual rival in terms of physical prowess, clever Beta men will gaslight the *Alphas* by attempting to change their understanding of what the rules of the sexual marketplace are. **Your Blue Pill conditioning has been one long effort in intra-sexual competition.** It's become so extreme that literally anything a man does, is interested in, wears, purchases or believes can question his masculinity.

Disqualifying a rival for women's intimate consideration is the key to this form of intra-sexual combat. He will do all the work for you if you can convince your superior rival to doubt his intentions in ever flaring his peacock's tail in the first place. This is why any form of *Peacocking* will always be characterized as ridiculous and inauthentic by average men while they flex and peacock themselves.

Have a Look - Style vs. Peacocking

Understanding the difference between Peacocking and having a style is one of these confusions. “Wear a funny top hat? Black nail polish? Get the fuck outta here!...” Guys new to Game tend to conflate the more extreme aspects of Peacocking with having a style or, as *Adam Carolla* once put it, having **a Look**.

This is an awkward switch for “regular” guys to make. For most of their lives, they’re told to **Just Be Themselves**. They take comfort in tropes like, “*I don’t want to be with a girl who doesn’t like me for who I am,*” yet they wonder why they’re dateless virgins who’ve never kissed a girl at 29.

It’s essential to have **a Look**. The basis of physical arousal will be static for women but always bear in mind that a Look is contextual. The archetypal “douchebag” with tattoos and an MMA appeal is a Look. *Guyliner*, black nail polish, and skinny jeans are a Look. The guy in an expensive Armani has a Look. There are countless more, but the point is that women are like casting agents looking for a character to fit a role. But does a Look imply “any” look?

Depending on cultural context, men can look so bizarre that it’s hard to imagine them conforming to a compelling character sought by a particular group of women. Can freakishness be a Look in attracting women? “Freakishness” to some is mundane to others. Everyone plays a role on any given day and in any given circumstance. I may wear jeans and a t-shirt if I want, but I’m treated differently when I opt to dress in a sports coat or a blazer. Why?

Because it connotes respectability, even if it’s not necessarily legitimate. I laugh when people assume a

Lamborghini in an Instagram shot must be rented, but they don't assume the same of a guy in an expensive suit. When I did liquor promos at various clubs, my persona and dress changed to match the environment. Am I something I'm not? What you wear to a job interview is different from what you'd wear to a funeral or a wedding. Is that what you wear when you're the *real* you?

A guy like *Mystery* doesn't wear elevator boots and top hats to the 7-11 to buy a big gulp. Men and women go to nightclubs (sexual zones) to show off and hopefully attract the attention of the opposite sex. Dress down or dress up both imply an expectation of congruency with the person's style. Club hopping in full *Gene Simmons'* KISS stage attire with no context isn't impressing anyone. But that's what average guys without a Look like to poke fun at – the extremes.

The reason for this is most guys are ***stylistically rudderless***. They can't get past the self-consciousness that's been conditioned into them to adopt a Look. It feels like an act. They don't want to be poseurs, so presuming to adopt a style makes them feel awkward. They never go in any stylistic direction or can't see that their *no-style* is *a style*. They won't accept that they *need* a schtick even when they already have a schtick.

Guys who get laid the least are stylistically *non-guys* because their generic, unassuming, default Look telegraphs "***I'm a Beta***" to women. Sensible clothes, boring button-downs, *Dockers*, logo'd t-shirts, etc. What's his thing? *No* thing.

Game Maxim #14: *What gets you laid is having a "thing."*

In today's sexual marketplace, the average guy gets punished for not being a bullshit artist. They don't have a

stylistic *thing* by which women can measure his congruency. The ***Just a Guy guy*** is telegraphing his congruency as plain and mundane by having no stylistic metric. If you've ever thought that ***most men are invisible to women***, this is why.

You don't have a *thing*. You can't expect to be **visible** to women (especially in the age of *Instagram*) if she has nothing to read. Better to be a peacock with shitty feathers than blend in with the rest of the drab mundane males who look like peahens.

Is it inauthentic posing? Of course it is! It's all bullshit; but that bullshit is the perception women need to see if they want to invest themselves in solving the mystery of you. Again, nothing is more self-satisfying for a woman than to believe she's figured you out using her *feminine intuition*, but you don't get to that part without having a *thing* to draw them in with.

All your sincerity, intelligence, and ephemeral qualities that *should* logically make you the obvious choice to pair up with don't translate into an ounce of pussy. In the opening stages of arousal and attraction, **women want attitude**. Women are like casting agents; they want a *type* for the character they think will satisfy the role of the guy they need at that time in their lives. The tough brother from the streets, the *Casanova*, the Bad Boy with a Harley, the tortured artist, the Emo Goth guy, whatever the context. But if you're *Just a Guy* guy, you're invisible.

Peacocking

Peacocking is not a style. It is a functional seduction skill (so is the use of *props*). It takes a sense of *style* to pull it off effectively, but Peacocking is more about use-of-instance than your overall look. When the seduction communities were in their infancy, the idea of Peacocking was pretty much a no-brainer. It's not too hard a concept to follow. Socially adept people usually want to set themselves apart from the mating herd. Look at the multi-colored hair of modern *women* today.

Look at the gender ambiguity of young men today. These trends are an artless form of "***I'm special, look at me,***" Peacocking. Everyone Peacocks to some degree. Just selecting a tie or a pair of shoes for an occasion may seem innocuous enough, but subconsciously you make choices and develop preferences because you think they improve your appearance. We believe they complement our personalities and thus our odds for drawing attention.

The intent behind Peacocking is about having a subtle but distinguishable difference. It may be a conversation piece (a prop) that draws a woman into your frame. Expensive shoes are a natural pull for some girls. Unsurprising, considering most women's obsession with shoes.

One thing that's important to remember is women's sensitivity to covert sub-communication, body language, appearance, non-verbal cues, etc. They'll size one another up in the briefest glance and come to operative conclusions about a woman's status in their girl-world hierarchy. They use the same tools with the Men they find attractive. Newly Game-aware men, who are comfortable enough to venture using Peacocking, don't realize that a little goes a long way. Your Game is *not* Peacocking. Peacocking is just the flashy

lure used to get the fish to strike. It's up to you to play the fish once it's hooked.

A note on Perceptions

Intuitive perceptions are women's primary basis for making judgments about *everything*. While men will use information to make judgments, image influences women. If the bathroom in your office is anything less than sanitary and comfortable, women will use that as a gauge for the success of your entire business before considering actual financial data.

In that same regard, women use testimonials from other women over any proof-based demonstrations of success you have. These are generalizations, but they underscore that there are fundamental differences in how the two sexes perceive the world around them.

Bear in mind that the ability of the everyman to easily *create* the illusion of success has only been around for the last 100 years or so. The advent of protracted consumer debt has made the ability for people to acquire material possessions which allow them to feign the cues of success and status.

For a 21st century example, look no further than social networking – the ultimate way to craft a perception of status that may not be aligned with reality. Facades trump facts in female psychology, and it's nothing to fault women for. It's simply how they're wired. Men's role as leaders in relations with women is to control the facade.

Even when your status and quality are, in fact, authentic, the facade of perception is there for women. Keeping her interest level peaked is a function of her being able to bask in your success as a man. She associates her ego with it. It costs money and time to deliberately focus on one's image, especially if you are content with a low-complexity lifestyle.

It's a scary thought to consider how easy it is to sway the hearts and minds of most women simply with imagery over substance. The manipulation of the image makes even flat broke women work themselves into a rabid frenzy over \$500 purses. Successful politicians and marketers have become masters of working this psychology.

If there was any wonder why women are the primary consumers in western culture, look no further than the power that perception plays in women's decision-making processes. Let this reality inform your Game. **Women may claim to want truthfulness, but they do not want full disclosure.**

I'm sure readers are thinking, *"This is some idiotic shit. You're saying that I have to indefinitely manage my 'facade' and never let the fantasy perception drop? I can't possibly be expected to 'play a role' all the time! When can I **Just Be Myself** and be comfortable knowing she's into me for me?"*

The short answer is yes. **You must never let your guard down;** her emotionally associative, perceptual interpretations will *always* be an influencing factor in assessing your hypergamous worth for her. However, the practical answer is maintaining that perception becomes increasingly easier to do as you build upon prior perceptions and legitimately own those perceptions as part of your personality.

Whether you're Game savvy or not, every woman you engage with, whether a plate to spin or a monogamous potential mate, your role and character have all been crafted by the sum of the perceptions she's built around you. Even before the moment you approached her with the romantic interest, you've been progressively layered with her emotionally associative perceptions.

Perhaps by friends, social media, maybe actual social proof, or even pre-conditioned expectations that she cast you in, your personality to her is a total of layers of

emotional perception. The longer your relationship, the more this perception becomes solidified.

The difficulty men have with using this perception dynamic is due to their not accepting how women cognitively differ from men. It seems patently disingenuous for a man to manipulate a woman's perception of him to his advantage when he's been convinced that women are coequal rational agents needing factual information to base their personal decisions on.

This is the equalist's tripping stone; men's acculturation has taught the average guy that women are cognitive equals to men. I didn't say superiors or inferiors; I mean functional equivalents. The sad part is that men are, passively or actively, always making attempts to influence that feminine emotional perception. When a married guy tells me his wife has no respect for him, the root of that condition lies in an inconsistency of perception on his part.

Game Break: Play to the Meta

Peacocking can be a lot of fun, but you have to be outcome independent to enjoy it. In the early days of the PUA communities, there was an exercise taught to reduce approach anxiety. A crew of guys would go out *sarging* in the clubs with the express purpose of getting blown out by women. The game was simple; the guy with the most rejections for the night won the pot of money everyone threw in. Later there were special awards for the most spectacular flameout or “**closest to the pin**,” the guy who almost closed a girl but got rejected at the last moment.

This exercise had a point. It taught guys not to get overly invested in the outcome of an approach. When you're in the moment, Game should be enjoyable just for its sake. What produces anxiety for guys hangs on their expectations of the outcome. The Blue Pill conditions average men to be gravely dependent on an outcome. This sucks. It makes even the thought of Game an uncomfortable and anxious affair.

What's worse, is this discomfort and anxiety manifests in the average man's behavior when trying to become intimate with women. The good news is that in the same way you were conditioned to be outcome dependent, you can unlearn that dependency and make Game its own reward. That enjoyableness in Game manifests as behaviors that *are* attractive to women. It's much easier to adopt a ***no fucks given*** attitude when you genuinely don't care about the outcome – you learn to enjoy the process. A great game is one where even losing it is still a lot of fun.

Likewise, Peacocking should be enjoyable. It's experimental, but ultimately it's a creative pursuit. All great artists have to get over the fear of rejection or disapproval. To stand out among a crowd, you must play to

the *meta*. The *Meta* is whatever is expected at a specific venue. A guy dressed to the nines in a casual jeans and t-shirt setting is playing to the *Meta*. That guy stands out in that environment, but two guys similarly dressed look like a gay couple.

Peacocking is intimately linked with understanding situational awareness and planning accordingly. The ultimate form of Peacocking is having an incredible physique, but if you're one among many guys with great bodies, you'll have to play to that *Meta*.

It's okay to stand out. That's the whole point of Peacocking, but you have to be situationally aware. Otherwise, your attempts to show off will look incongruent and can work against you. Above all other considerations, your projected look must be congruent with your expected personality.

A guy who looks like a rock star, with women hanging on his arms laughing, *is* a rock star. Everyone notices him in the club, and the effect is self-generating social proof. The same guy sulking alone in a corner looks like a loser in a costume. To play to the *Meta*, you must be congruent. Peacocking will be an intolerable anxiety for you until you unlearn outcome dependence and unite your personality with your *Look*.

JEALOUSY

Game Maxim #16: *She was never yours. It was just your turn.*

This maxim has been around since the earliest days of Pickup Artists' online communities. Like much of the *old wisdom* of that time, the reasoning for it gets distorted by various factions of today's *Manosphere*. Today, on the extreme end of MGTOW, communities - Black Pill, Doomers, and VolCels - are what most mainstream audiences conflate with *Red Pill*.

Along with *Success Porn* niche marketers, they pick and pull the parts of Red Pill praxeology that resonates with their personal beliefs and demonize what doesn't. Both factions are interested in misconstruing what the *Red Pill* has taken 20 years to develop. It doesn't serve the ends of either perspective to spend too much time sorting out a contentious *Red Pill* principle when misrepresenting it confirms their belief sets - especially when doing so generates views, subs, and ad revenue.

To the *Doomer* mindset, *She's not yours...* is confirmation of women's duplicitous, fickle and *evil* nature. That's not to say their nihilistic perspective doesn't grasp women's nature; it just means their way of coping with it is *surrendering* to it and giving up on women. This also gets mixed up in the *Doomer* understanding of Hypergamy.

Hypergamy resonates with them because it affirms that all women will dump a guy at the first sign of his losing an *Alpha Frame*, an *act* which he must constantly maintain in a world of endless options and attention for women. Slip up once too often, and she's gone at the first opportunity.

It's a fallacy of ***Hypergamy as a straight jacket***. *She's not yours...* justifies defeatism. You will never find lasting contentment with a woman because she holds the first

right of refusal in any intimate relationship (i.e., *Briffault's Law*). Ergo, sooner or later, your turn will be over, and all the effort, time, and emotion you invested in her will be for nothing (i.e., *Sunk Cost*, **Relational Equity**).

It may be worse than nothing when you consider the opportunity cost of having bothered with trying to make her *yours* in the first place. While the *juice* might taste good in the short term, it's never really *worth the squeeze* in the long term. This *final solution* upsets *Success* gurus because it's a logic that's hard to refute – at least from their own **Man Up!** perspective.

But that's the *Doom Pill* interpretation. It's based on reflexive, immutable binary extremes – the default reaction of this generation – because it confirms the hopelessness that defines them. Ironically, it was the same PUAs of the 2000s they despise so much who originally coined the phrase. Back then, it reminded guys never to get too attached to one particular woman while *dating* several women concurrently.

It was a mantra to ward off the spirit of ONEitis because they were spinning plates, and “*catching feelings*” for a girl would ruin them. It was a maxim that worked best as **preventive medicine**. Early practitioners of *Game* saw *Game* as a means to achieve the ideal monogamy that *Blue Pill* social conditioning convinced them should be their goal. **Average men build lives around serial monogamy.**

It's always been the surest way to solve the average man's reproductive problem. So when you open them up to an abundance of sexual/intimate potential via *Game*, they tend to use it to get their **Dream Girl** and ignore what the *Red Pill* says about women's nature.

In today's 'sphere, ***She was never yours; it was just your turn*** is cope for guys who invested in a woman who dumped or divorced them. Despite all their best *Blue Pill* qualifications, or their *Game* savvy, Hypergamy eventually

gets the best of all women, and she'll move on to the *bigger and better deal*. This presupposes stable monogamy, not spinning plates, should be the goal-state for every guy. Notice the maxim here is cast in the past tense.

*She **was** never yours...* At some stage, a man believes she is *his* (or should be), and she no longer is now. Thus, *She was never yours* becomes a post-facto rationalization to the guy who's probably feeling gutted by his breakup. The real issue is the guy's want for a permanent solution to his desire for intimacy. We see this all the time among *simps* who spend small monthly fortunes to achieve some virtual intimacy with his favorite *OnlyFans* cam-girl.

In this case, *She was never yours* is reconfirmed for *simps* over and over as they move from one cam-girl obsession to the next. They have virtual breakups with virtual girlfriends and are virtual serial monogamists - all without sex.

For the *Success Porn* guru, all this is grist for the mill. On the one hand, men struggling with confidence (see *social skills*), achieving intimacy/sex, and finding purpose is their bread and butter. On the other hand, they usually sell the *Blue Pill* ideal of sustainable contentment for otherwise discontent men.

That contentment includes the hope that a permanent, loving, and monogamous relationship with one woman is possible and a sign of his *authentic manhood*. When *Dr. Phil* sells this hope, we write him off as naive, out-of-touch, and an old-order *thinker*. However, this same *Blue Pill* hope is repackaged and sold online as a **return to masculine virtue** by today's *Life Coaches* in the *Hustle Economy*.

The permanence of your contentment amounts to your ability to qualify for it and sustain it with their (usually repackaged) concept of traditional masculine virtue. Any discontent on the client's part reflects his lack of determination or hard work to achieve it. 80's Televangelists and 90's *Multi-level Marketing* hustlers used

similar pitches. It's a monetized version of the philosophy of *personal responsibility* — which has always been a darling of traditional conservatism and is now a staple of *personal development*.

Any failure of the concept is always attributable to the man's deficient effort and investment, which can then be attached to his character. This isn't to say that *all* personal development guys are unscrupulous hustlers. It's just that the onus of education always rests with the student's discernment.

She's not yours; it was just your turn and other unignorable truths that the *Red Pill* makes men aware of defeats the self-reinforcing circular logic of the *personal responsibility* hustle. It forces the hustler to admit that something outside men's control *might* affect their lives.

Rather than accept this and work within the framework, the response is more of the same; deny the phenomenon exists or presume that even acknowledging it is indicative of a defeatist mentality — thus, a shirking of personal responsibility which completes the circular logic. Most *Success Porn* is similarly unfalsifiable.

Now that we understand the opposing sides of the *impermanence of women* debate, we also have to consider the *Lie of Individuation* that usually gets thrown into the mix to dismiss the *She's not yours* maxim. The *Individuation Fallacy* is most easily understood as:

"People are all individually special cases; each a unique product of their environments and experiences, and are far too individually complex to understand via generalizations according to sex, etc."

In this fallacy the *individual* supersedes any commonalities attributable to biology or evolution. It usually focuses solely on social constructionism and

personal circumstance as a basis for motivating behavior, developing personality, and influencing others. The importance of the *individual* is the natural extension of an underlying belief in *The Blank Slate*. When you start from a belief that we're all functional equals, everyone is an angel or a devil according to their choices.

But, depending on the person's circumstances, they can be forgiven or damned for the consequences of those choices. This is how we get rationales like *not all women are like that* and "*People are too complex to categorize.*" These conveniently dismiss the unignorable commonalities in men and women in the information age. People hate to think they aren't in some way unique as much as they hate to believe determinism has influenced what makes them special. The ***Individuation Fallacy*** also dovetails nicely into a doctrine of *personal responsibility*.

When we read some example of a woman opting out of a relationship (or sex) with one guy to take up with another, the reflexive response is to individualize her behavior according to her individualized circumstances. She's *damaged*, she's got *Daddy Issues*, she's *insecure* because you weren't *Man Enough*, etc.

Any consideration that points away from explaining her actions as women's innate nature is the reflexive explanation. *She's not yours; it was just your turn* defines her actions in a concrete visceral understanding of women's nature. This conflicts with the *Blank Slate's* individualism.

Men have an evolved need to know paternity. Unhindered by social strictures or women's Hypergamous filtering, men would opt for unlimited access to unlimited sexuality as our innate and preferred mating strategy. The majority of men have never been able to actualize this strategy. Thus, socially enforced monogamy became the best mating strategy compromise for men as modified by

the selection pressures of women's mating strategies. The risk in this compromise is the assurance of paternity.

If a man is going to compromise mating opportunities with many women to parentally invest in one woman, the deal *must* come with one condition: the child must be his genetic stock, or the compromise invalidates his existence (evolutionarily speaking). To ensure this, **men evolved a mental firmware that predisposes us to jealousy**, mate guarding, and desire to *possess* a woman. This is why we develop **A Sense of Ownership** with our girlfriends, wives, and children.

The dynamics of *Kin Selection* and *Kin Altruism* all find their root in men's imperative to ascertain their paternity and protect their genetic legacy. Jealousy is part of both sexes' firmware, but jealousy is an evolutionary imperative for men. The need to control women's sexuality is nothing less than men's evolutionary compulsion to ensure their compromise in parental investment is not for nothing.

Men could nominally control the reproductive process in a social order where masculine responsibility to wife and children was balanced with commensurate male authority. Part of that process included **possessing** a woman. This was both an evolutionary imperative and a social imperative.

Game Maxim #17: *Every man loves a slut; he just wants her to be his slut.*

Today, the thought of *owning* a woman is an affront to female-primary sensibilities. Feminism and gynocentrism have conditioned generations of women to believe they are autonomous '*things*' with no need for anything outside themselves – least of all men – to find *true contentment*. They are **Strong Independent Women®** who believe their fulfillment comes from self-ownership.

Eschewing a man's surname in marriage, or even marriage at all, is a sign of *independence* and stiff middle finger to the idea of passive femininity and notions of ever submitting to a man's authority. The evolved complementarity between men and women is replaced with the social contrivance of an idealized egalitarianism. Husband and wife are replaced with "*Equal Partners*."

For women, the problem with this equalist fantasy is biology and evolved impulses are excused, if not encouraged, in a social order that prioritizes women's mating strategies. Anything goes when the worst consequences of women's Hypergamy can (enthusiastically) be attributed to men's inability to accept them as *individuals*.

The problem for men is that we still have an innate *want* to possess a woman to ensure our paternity. This desire for permanency with one woman was both an evolutionary and social imperative in a patriarchal social order. In a Gynocentric social order, the evolutionary imperative to possess a woman remains, but the social imperative says... ***She was, is, and never will be yours; it was just your turn.*** That is why this maxim rubs so many men the wrong way.

Make her jealous

Flirt with other women in front of her. Do not dissuade other women from flirting with you. Women will never admit this, but jealousy excites them. The thought of you turning on another woman will arouse her sexually. No girl wants a man that no other woman wants. The partner who harnesses the gale storm of jealousy controls the direction of the relationship.

Jealousy works. This is the 2nd Commandment of Poon as enumerated by *Roissy* in 2009. Average men with limited options in women think this is the most counterintuitive aspect of Game. It goes against everything their Blue Pill conditioning has taught them. *“I can’t have her thinking other women want me! If she gets jealous, she’ll leave me!”*

When all you’re accustomed to is sexual scarcity, it makes sense that you don’t want to blow your one shot at happiness with a girl by hinting that she doesn’t have your undivided attention. If you hope to be good at Game, put that notion out of your head right now. The human jealousy instinct, and the *Dread* that results from it, are some of the best tools in your Game toolkit.

If you’ve read my first book, *The Rational Male*, you’re already familiar with the importance of stoking a woman’s imagination. Instilling jealousy and passive dread is critical in prompting a woman’s imagination.

In *Breadcrumbs*, I made the case that nothing is as self-satisfying for a woman than to believe she’s figured you out using her *feminine intuition*. The process of her figuring you out involves the use of her imagination. The ultimate goal of figuring a guy out is determining if he’s as valuable (to her and other women) as he makes himself out to be. *Feminine intuition* is used to determine honest value

signals from an interested man. But *feminine intuition*, for all its mysterious infallibility, is unreliable.

Women need the third-party confirmation of a man's *quality* through their sisters' approval or disapproval of him. In various ways, this is known as ***Preselection***. Do her girlfriends think you're hot, cute, or *boyfriend material*? Does her mother think you're a loser? Do your friends openly admire you around her? All of this is *Preselection*.

Occasionally, the dynamics of social proof will overlap with preselection; just know that *Preselection* is specifically about intersexual dynamics. Social proof, while necessary to Game, is much broader in scope.

When we read the word "jealousy," it infers negative connotations. It's the *Green Monster*! That's *envy*, not jealousy. If you see a guy with a hot girlfriend, you may feel *envious* of him, but you don't feel jealous because you don't have any real investment in his girlfriend. If your girlfriend tells you she loves you and then hooks up with another guy, you'll feel jealous. Envy is wanting what you never had. Jealousy is a fear of losing what you thought you'd already earned (e.g., relationship equity).

Men and women both feel jealousy, but each sex has different evolutionary reasons for feeling it. Jealousy, in and of itself, is not necessarily a bad thing. Feeling jealousy is a pragmatic way of hedging our reproductive bets. However, to feel the emotion of jealousy, we must have some preconceived notion of value about something or someone. We then invest ourselves emotionally in the value of that thing or person.

So, when that thing or person is removed from us, it represents a loss in opportunity cost. That's time and effort we could've spent in a better investment, but that loss, or even the suggestion of that loss, stings more when it's associated with the emotions of reproductive interests. This

is why jealousy is so powerful in human dynamics. It's a psychological insurance policy for sunk cost efforts.

Preselection is where jealousy begins. Before we can feel jealousy for someone, they must have an implied value. The easier it is to determine that value, the more value we tend to place on them. Also, as single mommies know, the urgent necessity of a person will factor into our evaluation. What is easily had, mundane, or ordinary is less valuable, but scarcity increases the price. This is where Preselection enters the jealousy metric.

The more a person's value is appreciated by others, the greater the prompt for jealousy. This jealousy effect is amplified when the ones doing the appreciating are your intra-sexual competitors. Preselection becomes a double-edged sword for women. They need third-party confirmation of your value, but there's no better confirmation than the sexual interests of other women in you.

This is an essential aspect of Game: Preselection is a prompt for jealousy.

Go with it. Never dissuade jealousy in a woman. You don't have to prompt it overtly, but never try to alleviate a woman's jealousy when it is triggered. It works in your favor. Jealousy reminds a woman of the value she has for you. The opportunities for strategically stoking feelings of jealousy in women are few and far between when you're in a committed relationship. Do *not* defuse these opportunities when they arise.

Game Maxim #18: *A woman cannot fall in love with a man until she feels jealousy for him.*

The Fear of Missing Out (FOMO) is endemic to the female experience. If you want to sell any product to women, good marketers will tell you to play on FOMO. Get this deal before it expires! This speaks to the evolutionary dichotomy of women's life-long need for security vs. the perishable sexual market value needed to get *the best she can do*.

FOMO increases as women's sexual agency decays. When a woman feels jealousy for you, understand this; she fears losing the value she holds for you. This fear is amplified as your value increases, and hers decreases.

This is a fundamental key to Game. Jealousy is a requirement for genuine desire and love. **If she can't feel jealousy for you, her investment in you is mitigated by a doubt that she could do better than you.** Until a woman cannot stand the idea of you being with another woman (jealousy), she will never make a complete emotional investment in you.

Let me clarify; **this is *not* about inducing fear to manipulate a woman into "loving" you.** It's about understanding the root motivations of her genuine desire.

Women want a man who other men want to be (*envy*), and other women want to fuck (*jealousy*).

In this simple equation lies the mechanics of how women emotionally invest in a man's value. Women will never allow themselves to invest emotionally in a man who doesn't in some way hold value for other women. When you see marriages deteriorate into ugly divorces, the thing that decides it for a wife is she sees no outside value expressed for the husband. The man, a woman, *selects* is an ego association with her value.

If the man is confirmed as *high value*, she must be the kind of woman who *could* lock him down. Her value is

inferred in his value. Jealousy in women only occurs when a man's (SMV) sexual market value is perceived to be higher than a woman's own. Women don't mate guard Beta schlubs. Guys who married in their 20s discover that the girl they thought was *out of their league* then becomes possessive and jealous in their mid-30s.

This is due to her SMV decaying while his value ascends. By their mid-30s, if a man maximizes his potential, she needs him more than he needs her. Whether he acknowledges this shift is irrelevant; her hindbrain is making the evaluation. Conversely, if it turns out she made a bad bet in her 20s by marrying a guy who never became high-value in his 30s, that's when she exits the marriage – before she's *too old to attract a winner*. That's the rationale anyway.

There is nothing more threatening yet simultaneously arousing for a woman than a man who's aware of his worth to women.

Let this maxim guide you, and you'll find it defuses women's game-playing and pragmatically weeds out the disingenuous ones. You'll be called arrogant and cocky. Women (and feminized men) will try to test your self-assuredness in your value; but the guy who fearlessly embraces his value – a value that increases over time while women's decreases – and stokes **the jealousy women love to feel** will be loved, appreciated, and respected in the long term.

Jealousy is a failsafe for ensuring paternity in men, but jealousy in women is a reinforcer of a man's value (FOMO) in women. I'm not suggesting a woman needs to feel jealousy as some all-consuming, ceaseless, possessive obsession for you. She just needs to have felt jealousy at

some point for her subconscious to invest in you emotionally. Jealousy is necessary.

*"A woman does not truly know that she is attracted to you until she feels **jealousy**."*

- Mystery

APPROACH ANXIETY

Approach anxiety is the number one Game-killer I read from guys just getting into putting it into practice. Approach anxiety isn't a *Game* thing. The nervous hesitation a boy feels before he musters up the courage to ask the cute girl to the middle-school dance is the stuff of countless movies. Average guys choke on approach anxiety because they've internalized a gender power differential. At least 80% of men are Beta.

When we look at this *Pareto Principle*, we focus on how women's Hypergamy selects for and selects-against men in the sexual marketplace. We overlook how this 80/20 rule affects men's adapting to it. In the simplest terms, a majority of men are selected-against reproduction. We can even see this reflected in the human genomic record.

Far more women reproduce than men. But, the good news is this; you are the product of all the men in your family tree who successfully bred with a woman at some point in history. Were all your forefathers such **Alpha Chads** that they ended up in the 20th percentile of men selected for reproduction by your foremothers?

Odds are, they weren't. They figured out some form of *Game* to compensate for whatever kept them in the 80%, and they managed to deploy it successfully enough to ultimately produce you. And rest assured, they all felt some degree of anxiety before they deployed it with your mom.

From an evolutionary perspective, you *should* feel anxiety in approaching women. It's literally written into your DNA. At some point in our ancestral past, the fear of approaching a woman for intimacy was a survival adaptation. Just like jealousy served a purpose for mate guarding, approach anxiety produced a hesitancy in men that might have kept them alive longer than the men who didn't feel it.

That anxiety is universal in men; it's not a social construct as many will make it out to be. Social orders have picked up on this fear and built up conventions around it, but the fear itself is innate. Evolution selected for men who erred on the side of caution in their approaches with women.

That fear comes from two places – the fear of retaliation and the fear of rejection. The fear of retaliation is easy. When humans lived in small tribes of no more than 150 members, odds were pretty good that a choice woman was already taken as a mate or the daughter or sister of a man who'd probably beat your ass even if she did find you attractive.

This sense of urgency, combined with the very real need to *ejaculate and evacuate*, is why men get aroused so quickly by the sight of a half-naked woman. Men don't need much in the way of foreplay like women do precisely because we evolved to be very quick, very efficient, opportunistic breeders.

The fear of rejection is a little more complex. Again, in our ancestral past, if a young man made an unsuccessful approach in a low-population tribe, the dynamics of negative social proof among other eligible young women could prevent him from ever being considered as a suitable mate.

In the most extreme sense, this may even prevent him from passing his DNA on to the next generation. **Social ramifications have existential consequences for men.** Thus, approach anxiety is a very real thing for us. If you can take any comfort in this, just know that you are descended from men who also benefited from the caution that approach anxiety prompted in them.

Approach anxiety is a common insecurity among men. Google "approach anxiety." You'll get an endless list of niche marketing hustlers selling you his (or her) 7-step way to overcome it. Most of these *steps* are simplistic positive

thinking mantras and schmaltzy aphorisms meant to psych you up before asking Stacy out.

But, you still choke. It's one thing to summon the courage to make a real-life approach in a club or at school, but it's quite another to know how to carry on a conversation after that approach. That's usually what halts a guy in his tracks.

The modern conveniences of dating apps are all *buffers* meant to alleviate this anxiety in men while delivering the paradox of choice to women. But once you get past the awkward online introductions, approaching and opening a real-life human female is a confrontation. It feels like salesmanship, and unless you're primed and interested in a product, few people like to be *sold to*.

The hesitancy guys feel doesn't come from a fear of rejection or retaliation; it now comes from a belief in ***Leagues***. If you have a preconception that a woman is above you in SMV, you've already done half of the rejection for her.

Worse still, guys get habituated to a pre-rejection assumption. Then they spend their best years convincing themselves fate has conspired to keep them in the 80%. With today's convenient sedation of porn and entertainment, it's never been easier for men to just give up.

Approach anxiety "specialists" will do their best to ease your irrational reasons for not approaching by calling it a *fear* you need to overcome. Practice makes perfect. Change up where you meet girls. Keep it simple, don't overthink it. Stand up straight. Be honest. Find common interests. These sound pretty good. It's hard to argue against "being genuine," but most guys don't have a problem with that. Just being yourself is the heart of Blue Pill Beta Game. It's getting to the actual part of *being genuine* that throws men off.

Attraction and arousal are about perceptions, not being honest – even if those perceptions are accurate. Most men overthink their approaches, but that overthinking begins in the presumption of compared value. Few guys have any problem interacting with a woman they have no sexual interest in.

Whether you think you're an introvert or an extrovert, you probably don't have any trouble carrying on a conversation with an overweight housewife in the grocery store. The sexual value differential is entirely absent. Anxiety level, zero.

But, if you see a smoking hot SMV-9 swimsuit model in the grocery store, the differential kicks in. Anxiety level, 100! **She's out of your league** and all the "stand up straight" bullshit some dating coach told you to remember makes no difference because you're paralyzed. You've never done this before. Look at you. You're *George McFly*; why bother? You know what will happen. Oh well, where's the *Nutella* aisle?

Men innately get intimidated by beautiful women. The natural state of performance for interest between men and women is integral to intersexual dynamics. Men perform; women choose. It takes time, experience, and confidence from an abundance of options for a man to condition this value differential out of his thinking. Most men never do. They feel like God himself must've taken pity on him by rewarding him with a beautiful wife.

This unconscious acknowledgment of the value differential is why men will reflexively self-deprecate when introducing their wives or girlfriends to new people. They just *know* they aren't in that girl's league. They never presume to assess their value for fear of seeming egotistical or *being someone they're not*. They never think of making themselves their *Mental Point of Origin*, and over time, they never do.

Game Maxim #19: *Always let a woman figure out why she won't fuck you, never do it for her.*

If this looks familiar, it's because it's also ***Iron Rule of Tomassi #8***. While it can be helpful to get psyched up on positivity to approach women, it's better to understand the mechanics of that anxiety before you can train yourself to push past it. Early PUAs had exercises that would help guys get past the awkwardness of an approach.

On one night, a group of guys would actively try to get rejected. They'd compete for the most and the best rejections by the night's end. This was to get guys used to initiate a conversation without the value differential self-consciousness and learning outcome independence in Game. Average men live in a state of sexual scarcity. As such, every potential encounter for intimacy is idealized and super-valued. They over-invest in the importance of success or failure with a woman.

Research shows men tend to overestimate a woman's interest in them, while women underestimate men's interests. That's just evolution being pragmatic with our sexual strategies, but it also leads less sexually successful men to adopt strategies that should work in their state of scarcity. Therefore they put all their eggs in one basket with women and super-value the importance of rejection. This is where approach anxiety begins for average men.

To overcome approach anxiety, you must unlearn that which you have learned.

First, and most importantly, you *must* unlearn the concepts of *Leagues*. A subconscious belief in the value differential women have vs. your own is why your mental process starts with *Leagues*. It's a false assumption because it presumes SMV is always static (it's not), and it

traps you in false security. Women's only real agency in life is their sexuality. It's why they *always get naked* when they want to protest something.

At the peak of her agency, a stunning woman holds power over men, but that power is perishable. A man's agency and SMV are derived from many sources and have the potential to far outlast that of women. While a hot SMV-9 girl may seem intimidating in her beauty, you'll have more long-term value potential if you begin to think strategically rather than tactically. This is called *Grand Strategy* thinking.

View the war as a whole (strategy) rather than individual battles (tactics). The hot 22-year-old you who rejects your approach (tactics) becomes the semi-attractive 32-year-old who's glad she bumped into you again a decade later (strategy).

It's better to aim too high and fail than to aim too low and succeed. The world is full of average men who settled on succeeding with low aim because they had no concept of their future potential. They had no sense of *Grand Strategy*.

Disabuse yourself of *League* thinking right now. *League* thinking is tactics. It presumes a woman's value will stay static. Strategic thinking *knows* that a woman's value is perishable. I don't care if you make cold/day game approaches or just want to get with the cute cashier at the store – **there are no Leagues for you anymore.**

Train yourself to ignore a woman's beauty. Beauty and sexuality are the sources of women's agency. Tacitly deny them this, and your interactions with women will transform from tactics to strategy. Apprehension and self-consciousness are replaced with **Amused Mastery** when a woman perceives you're unaffected by her looks. You'll have better interactions with her because the power of her beauty is removed.

She's not *out of your league* because any guy who her beauty cannot affect must be a guy accustomed to other

beautiful women. It may not be the truth, but does it really matter if she can't tell the difference? Stop using "*hot, cute, smokin', or beautiful*" to describe women. Instead, say to yourself, "she's interesting" or "she might be worth getting to know."

Never compliment a girl on her looks, especially not a girl you aren't fucking. Demonstrate your interest in a woman; never explain it to her. Women are far better at understanding implicit communication than men will ever appreciate. Speak without speaking. Compliment her through your attitude, not your language, and it will stimulate her need for intrigue in *figuring you out*.

It makes no difference if you're objectively not the best man a woman can get; what matters is that you think and act like you are. Women instinctively read weakness in men; don't make it easy for them. ***Always let a woman figure out why she won't fuck you - never do it for her.***

Self-confidence, warranted or not, prompts a submission response in women. Irrational self-confidence will always get you more pussy than rational defeatism.

PART III

GAME DYNAMICS

SEXUAL ZONING

MGTOW is “avoiding women” and is a general maxim in the Manosphere, but a more general narrative pushed in mainstream media is that a “growing number of young men are avoiding women.” What does “*avoiding women*” mean in a socio-cultural context?

The word “avoid” entails active, deliberate, protective measures. The “avoidance of women” or a breakaway from women doesn’t look like that at all in practice today. The social context of male-female interaction has changed drastically in the last decade. In the old order, young people were expected to interact with each other in controlled environments that fostered long-term, monogamous, ideally assortative relationships.

This was a “holistic” approach where young people treated the other as potential future partners, sexual or otherwise, socially regulated. In all cases, they were permitted to interact in those environments. This was even the norm in workplaces where both men and women were present. The average man found a girlfriend through his extended family or social circle because families and social circles were more extensive.

What we have today is the complete opposite. Today we have “**Sexual Zoning.**” Some mixed-sex environments, like workplaces and school campuses, are entirely asexual zones. No potentially sexualized interactions are permitted to take place.

This is mandated by law and expected by society. In such environments, you’re supposed to strictly treat members of the opposite sex as co-equal, mutually rational colleagues or professional non-sexual beings.

On the other hand, mixed-sex environments like nightclubs are expected to be full-on sexual zones. Everyone there knows that all interactions entail the

potential for casual sex. It's your basic meet market. You're *expected* to hit on girls, and girls expect to be hit on by attractive men. Socializing in these environments requires action and engagement.

If you want to find a partner, either for sex or something more, you have to go there, and you have to have Game. In other words, ***avoidance of women*** in the old days was an anti-social act of disengagement that was frowned upon or at least made you seem a bit weird.

Today, ***avoidance of women*** means you're not expending excess energy and time to do certain things. It's an "*action*" with few or no social repercussions. You won't be socially ostracized for *doing* nothing, but technically it's not an action. You're basically "avoiding" women by not hitting the clubs on Saturday night. You're avoiding them through simple ***inaction***. You can have a full-time job, go to college, have a social circle, have hobbies, buddies, etc., basically a normie life, and still ***avoid women***.

There is a stark contrast in how ***sexual zones*** are presented to men by women. From an ***old books*** perspective, men are still expected to be the initiators. It's still men who are expected to approach and express interest in women. The men who don't - or who fail to build themselves into acceptable mates for women - are labeled as perpetual adolescents or quitters.

Our feminine-primary social mandate still promotes the old order expectation that men will prepare themselves for, and initiate with, women who will decide who benefits them most.

From a *new books* perspective, men are expected to know their place in whatever ***sexual zone*** they find themselves in. More importantly, they're expected to understand how they are perceived in the Sexual Market Place (SMP). In an asexual zone such as a college campus or the workplace, men are expected to know their SMV and act or not act accordingly.

Men not meeting or exceeding what would make for an ideal pairing with women are expected **not** to initiate or approach - until such time or circumstance or personal development makes him more *ideal*. Be hot. Don't not be hot. This expectation extends to sexual zones and fosters the avoidance prompt most average men are already prone to.

For all of the handwringing from gender pundits about men dropping out of life or the SMP, this contradiction in sexual zones promotes avoidance. Hypergamy is figuratively best served when women are in total and unilateral control of sexual selection. This is Gynocentrism in a nutshell. Thus, we see laws and social dictates installed to encourage men to self-select themselves out of the process and make this process easier for women.

Men will be **shamed for not initiating** and not approaching, but simultaneously be **held accountable for as much as hate crimes** if they step outside what they are expected to know are appropriate sexual zones.

Two decades into the 21st century and social scientists still can't explain why millennials aren't having as much sex as prior generations in an age when it's never been easier to hook up. Try as they will; nearly all explanations fail to account for how sexual zoning has affected the sexual marketplace. Millennials have the 'hook up generation' reputation, but **statistically, they're not doing much fucking.**

Noah, 18, likes to sit in front of several screens simultaneously: a work project, a YouTube clip, a video game. To shut it all down for a date or even a one-night stand seems like a waste. "For an average date, you're going to spend at least two hours, and in that two hours, I won't be doing something I enjoy," he said.

It's not that he doesn't like women. "I enjoy their companionship, but it's not a significant part of life," said

Noah, a Web designer in Bellingham, Washington. He has never had sex, although he likes porn. "I'd rather be watching YouTube videos and making money." Sex, he said, is "not going to be something people ask you for on your résumé."

The largely millennial writers and researchers are oblivious to the complexities of sexual zones that constantly shift for guys. Opportunities for hooking up abound. We've got Red Pill awareness and instantaneous communication, but we don't have clearly defined sexual zones.

As such, today's SMP has become a minefield for men. Put an awkward guy, whose social intelligence is subpar, into the wrong zone, and it follows that he'd have better things to occupy himself with that he "enjoys." It's just safer. This is a common refrain from the MGTOW communities. It's usually some variation of *"Why would I waste my time trying to untangle some girl's head to put myself at risk of a sexual harassment or rape accusation?"*

I had a blog commenter tell me this:

"MGTOW is now socially subsidized and easy to implement: just do nothing! Don't engage in class or "attend" the lectures online at college. Say no more in class or lab than you must, then leave. Start no conversations, and you won't be dragged into any. All of this goes for cubicle workers too. In the lunchroom, stare at your phone, eat at your desk, or, if you can, get outside but go alone. No feelings caught, no feelings hurt. Everybody expects nothing, everybody gets nothing, and therefore everybody wins.

Eventually, you can learn the fine art of disappearance in urban settings: yes, you occupy space, but other than someone bumping into you, it is possible to go anywhere without your registering

with anyone in the vicinity, not even cops. You can switch it on and off like a light.

*Eventually, the shaming begins to die down. It should. Because before that, you patriarchy-preaching Tumblr-inas insisted you wanted that corny-bro to leave? He's gone. Soft MGTOW is the **mandated social paradigm** outside of "safe social zones" like public streets, malls, clubs, etc. Plus, in some workplaces and colleges, it's actually the law. Are you going to complain about men obeying the law?"*

There's also no shortage of articles about the absence of boys and young men these days. A frequent bugbear in these always point to guys "dropping out" and playing X-Box all day.

More significantly than young women, young men are stuck in life. Research released in May from the Pew Center documented a historic demographic shift: American men aged 18-30 are now statistically more likely to be living with their parents than with a romantic partner. This trend is significant for a straightforward reason: Twenty- and thirty-something men living at home, working part-time or not at all, are unlikely to be preparing for marriage. Research says that these men are single, unoccupied, and fine with that—because their happiness doesn't depend on whether they are growing up and living life.

- America's Lost Boys - First Things 2016

This 2016 article presumes men's adulthood ought to be measured by their capacity to get involved with a woman, support a family, and maintain a steady job. It's tough for writers who tackle this topic to pull their heads out of the

old books reasonings. Thus, the go-to answer to “why do guys drop out?” is video games. It’s far easier to goof on men if they can be made to look juvenile, lazy, or stupid to the point of men not knowing what’s good for them.

It would take a real effort to tackle the more prominent reasons why men drop out. They would be forced to acknowledge the disincentives for men to participate in what the *old order* still tells men are mutually beneficial arrangements. Those disincentives don’t paint women in a flattering light, so it’s much easier to dismiss them as garden variety misogyny.

The dropout generation is content with their lot in life because they’ve accepted the realities of a social order that debases men and manhood. Men are just appliances to serve women’s needs better. The risks of investing themselves in a relationship or finding the inner will to become better men for “growing up” are significant when the rules are ineffective and sexual zones are deliberately ambiguous.

I would argue that most men accused of sexual harassment (or just suspected of impropriety) are socially inept men who’ve found themselves in an environment they believed was an acceptable sexual zone. They become **Creeps** by error, not by malice.

We are entering a time when all **zones** will be so indefinite, arbitrary, and ambiguous that every environment with sexual potential will be avoided. This will have the effect of putting women into unilateral control of their own Hypergamy. It will be a **Sadie Hawkins World** – only women will make approaches on men, and only men who match her (perceived) Hypergamous ideal — an ideal reinforced by a steady diet of social media ego-inflation.

Ironically, authors bemoaning the dropout generation of men never acknowledge the other side of the disincentives for men – those generated by a feminine-primary social narrative – the generation of women who remain unmarried

well into their middle age. It always returns to the same old order root. Women's dissatisfaction results from the irresponsible, juvenile, ridiculous men that the same narrative has created for itself.

Know Your Zones

All the Game savvy in the world won't insulate you from the dangers inherent in today's sexual marketplace. Self-loathing Black Pill *Doomers* will tell you that the rewards don't outweigh the risks, and those PUAs are just leading hapless fools into that minefield for a quick buck. And they'd be right if all *dating coaches* did was teach Game *tactics* without consideration for social and situational awareness.

What they fail to grasp is the intricacies of *Sexual Zoning*. You can't teach a socially awkward guy to memorize a few pickup routines and then throw him into any social environment. The guys who become the asocial *Creep* were afraid people would see them as if they could muster the confidence to attempt an approach. And that's the best-case scenario. God forbid you attempt Game in a zone where you might lose your job for doing so. Anti-Game *Doomers* will play on this fear to keep you in the crab bucket.

Game Maxim #20: *Game will always involve some form of risk.*

It's easier to assume that risk if it's a calculated risk based on accurate information. This is why you **must** know your zones. If you've never thrown a punch in your life, it would probably be a bad idea to get in the ring with a guy like *Conor McGregor*. That MMA ring is definitely *not* your zone. You know the insane risks of going into that zone and the likely consequences of attempting it anyway.

The possibility exists that you could knock out *Conor* with a hellishly lucky punch you remembered someone on TV throwing and take his title and the prize money. But

odds are you're gonna get your ass handed to you because you have no business being in that zone. Guys who understand Game (should) also understand social dynamics – and that understanding includes a finely tuned grasp of ***situational awareness***.

Earlier I emphasized the Game importance of knowing your environment. Now we must add **situational awareness** to that environment. Martial Arts are called *arts* because they require the fighter to assess his opponent, environment, and situation individually. The *art* is in applying his learned tools, skills, and natural talents to defeat his opponent given the circumstances. Similarly, Game is an *art* requiring much of the same process; only the goal is to achieve intimacy with a woman.

Situational awareness is a term borrowed from combat/conflict resolution experts. It's not just an environmental awareness, but it extends to people and personalities involved within that environment's conditions. It also extends to predictive frameworks and likely outcomes (good or bad) in that situation. In combat and hostage negotiations, understanding social cues and situational awareness can save, or cost, lives in crises. While it may not be life or death in terms of Game, **situational awareness** can save you a lot of personal damage and mitigate the risks mentioned above.

Sending a woman dick pics is **never** a good idea. This is a violation of **situational awareness**.

You've just given her future blackmail material – and there are no *revenge porn* laws that protect men sending an unsolicited shot of their junk to women. Even the women they've fucked before. The idea that a guy's dick image will improve his sexual status with a woman is evidence of **low social intelligence** and **zero situational awareness**.

And yet, drunk or sober, guys do this often enough that it's become a *thing* women equate with sexual assault – or retroactively if calling it out becomes profitable. The

situation is this: dick pics are *very* bad for Operational Security (OpSec). Any remote benefit you might gain from a dick pic is *overwhelmingly* offset by the potential of future damage to you.

Best Practice: **Never send anyone a dick pic.**

That's an easy illustration of situational awareness. The zone you're broadcasting your schlong into is the entire internet, probably her group of girlfriends, and potentially all your followers on *Instagram* when she gets vindictive after your breakup. All those *situations* are probably not something you considered before you pressed 'send' on your text (your ISP and cloud service also get a copy). In this case, your (bad) Game is the stupid belief that a picture of your junk will get her going.

The *zone* is the entirety of social media. I start with this example of zones because it's the broadest, most commonly disregarded zone guys take for granted. It is too expansive a social zone to account for every situational variable. This is why meticulous and consistent *Brand Management* of your online presence is vital to Game today. When asked where the best place to hook up, meet girls, find a partner, etc., most men (and women) respond with a dating app or matchmaking site.

Statistically, meeting a girl at a club, bar, concert, workplace, church, or through friends and family *pales* in comparison to online dating. And even those rare individuals who meet each other in analog ways still determine status, suitability, and general coolness from their social media presence. Therefore, social media is a sexual zone. However, situational awareness should also make us cautious of that zone.

Curating your social media persona is essential to good Game, but you must manage your brand to understand how

your brand can be used against you now and in the future. That doesn't mean you should keep a low profile; be ready to counterbalance zone infractions when you make yourself larger than life (perception is everything).

Average guys presume that nightclubs are for elite-level Players. Get that out of your head right now. Players who do well in the clubs, with Day Game, social circle Game, even charming girls at Bible study do so because they understand that zone. Their **situational awareness** is such that they know how much of the envelope they can push and the point of crossing the line into *Creep* territory. Is this awareness subjective to the Player using it? Absolutely. Do good-looking/extroverted guys have an easier time of it? Absolutely,... but only if that guy understands the zone, he's in.

Good looks and charm can forgive many Game sins, but if that guy blunders into an unfamiliar zone, he becomes the "dumb jock," the "Himbo," or the Frat Boy with zero situational awareness. He's an "*Edge-Lord*." Will he still do better with women despite it? Probably. He'll undoubtedly recover better than an average guy, but he still walked blindly into the same minefield you are.

Prominent zones are apparent. Nightclubs are sexual zones. Beach parties in Miami are sexual zones. Line dancing at the country bar? Sexual zone. Singles' ministry at church? Sexual zone. Mosh pit at a ***Lamb of God*** concert? Sexual zone (well, maybe after the show).

How about the gym? Hard to say. *Planet Fitness*, definitely not. I might've said yes if you'd asked me if the gym was a good place to meet women in 2005. Today I'd advise extreme caution, and only if there are solid indicators of interest from women.

If you go to the gym to meet women, you're there for the wrong reason. The gym can be a sexual zone, but only for higher-level in-shape Players with a good sense of situational awareness. The gym can be a prime location for

sexual harassment potential. Don't be a creep at the gym. There are too many yoked-up Blue Pill Alphas just waiting for a chance to punish you for a failed approach.

Your workplace is not a sexual zone

After 20+ years in the Manosphere, the most common question I still get about sexual zoning is, “*Rollo, do you think it’s a good idea to use Game on a coworker?*” Unless you’re a male porn star, the answer is always **no**. Guys will still give you the folk-wisdom about not dipping your pen in the company ink, but you need to be way more conscious of the socio-sexual dynamics in the workplace. If the SMP is a minefield, the average western corporate culture is the frontline.

It is a zone that is rife with Gynocentric opportunism, just waiting for your social awkwardness to tie your own noose. The modern female-centric workplace *expects* men to harass women. Anything that smells like Game, Red Pill awareness, or *Nice Guy* is a trip to the Human Resources department to address an anonymous complaint about your problematic behavior. Just don’t do it. Even if you own the business, just don’t do it.

I understand; the workplace is usually the only environment most average men are socially interacting in with any regularity. This should only highlight your need to get out of it and into new social venues. If the only place you ever interact with women is your workplace, you are ***domain-dependent***. That’s a big problem. Using Game in a closed social system like your workplace can be a recipe for personal disaster, especially if you’re awkwardly experimenting with new social skills on women familiar with you at work.

Your university or college social circle *can* be a sexual zone.

It's conditional and dependent on your Game savvy. In some ways, a university campus can be more dangerous than a modern workplace. Feminism and misandry pervade the social dynamism of every college today. The same hypersensitivity to *misogyny* and anything that hints at challenging the gynocratic norm is grounds for sexual assault allegations. I'm not joking.

Just voicing an opposing viewpoint to feminism is construed as "verbal assault." The fewer and fewer average men enrolling these days quickly learn to be as nondescript a male as possible. Sometimes they employ *Sneaky Fucker* Game by converting to feminism, hoping that an empowered, educated college girl might fuck him for being an "*ally*." Again, Beta Game is always bad Game.

A game-savvy guy with skills, good social acumen, and average to above average looks can *conditionally* make the feminist police-state university system work in his favor - if he's willing to navigate the risk. The problem most Blue Pill guys have with the college dating scene is they're playing by an old order ruleset while oblivious to the (often horrific) consequences of failing in a new order sexual marketplace.

If you're dead set on enjoying your college years at off-campus parties and running the risks of consensual-but-not-consensual-but-maybe-it-was-consensual alcohol-fueled sex, you'd probably do better to consider college campuses a non-sexual zone.

If you want to spin plates, date non-exclusively, and enjoy the intimacy of college women, you **must** commit to a calculated, sober Game that accounts for environment and situational awareness. Statistically speaking, college girls want to fuck - even the rabid feminists.

They want the *college experience* of fucking the archetypal Alpha-in-College, who they - inevitably - can't lockdown because he's being shared by other college girls

who want the same experience. It's an expectation you can use to your advantage - if you play it right.

However, do *not* catch feelings for any of these girls. The best practice is to keep college girls at arms distance because the moment any exclusivity is implied, is the moment you open yourself up to resentment, vindictiveness, and the full force of the gynocratic university system at her disposal.

That said, you should *never* employ Game in a college class or at any official school function. That's a caveat, not a hard rule. I know there are the rare funny, witty, charming guys who can deftly pull off "classroom" Game, but I would not advise it for a guy learning Game and experimenting with unfamiliar social skills in that setting. Situational awareness always includes self-awareness as part of the equation.

THE CREEP

What makes a guy “Creepy”?

I polled thousands of women in researching this, and the most consistent answer was *the inability of a guy to take a hint*.

Women believe there is some “**obvious**” (to them) boundary that “creepy” men always crossed that made them into creeps. You’re not far off if that sounds like the ‘*Just Get It*’ principle from my first book. This *creep detector* instinct is rooted in women’s innate psychological filtering for optimizing Hypergamy.

Women subconsciously expect men to “just get” everything about intersexual dynamics, both positive and negative. There is a fundamental difference between what men define as creepy, and what women “*feel*” is creepy regarding **creepy** men. “**Creepy**” is a euphemism women use for low-value guys who don’t understand that they’re not receptive to their approaches.

Creepy is a feeling for women. The old guy in the park eyeing young children is *creepy* in the same way a guy who *can’t take a hint* is a *creep*. Revulsion and disgust are visceral, instinctive emotions in humans that serve a protective purpose. The *creep* triggers a combination of revulsion and disgust as well as fear and loathing in women.

Women are the vulnerable sex. As such, their experience of *creepiness* is something men can’t empathize with. When we think of *creeps*, it may be the maniacal killer in the latest horror film who comes to mind, or maybe the pedophile who just got arrested. We can’t relate with that *creep* who obsesses over us because he wants us to love and bang him.

It’s important to make this distinction. For men and women, there is an instinct about other people’s behavior

that sets off psychological triggers alerting us that something isn't *right* about a person.

Humans evolved instincts about what makes us feel unsafe about other humans. When dealing with people with clinical neuroses, sometimes all it takes is to listen to that person's speech or watch their mannerisms. Meet someone who's "obviously drunk," and it's pretty easy to diagnose their state without smelling their breath.

We instinctively feel this person is not speaking (slurring) or behaving as a sober person would. Drunkenness is an easy illustration, but the same goes for symptoms of insanity (schizophrenia, paranoia, bipolar disorder). Unless we're naive or ignore the indicators, we can tell when someone is *off*.

People who can hide their disorders make detection a challenge. Functional Autism, Asperger's Syndrome, or acute social awkwardness can be manageable. We accept it as part of their personality, or we know it's a disorder, and we *normies* choose to embrace it as a quirk.

Social conditioning does us a disservice in this respect. A social order of tolerance and acceptance makes an instinctual sense that something is off about a person, something we should look past. We don't want to appear "*judgmental*." We're shamed for heeding the messages our instincts tell us are red flags about people.

Disorders that we used to consider abnormalities are things we're expected to have empathy for today. That's not to say that we shouldn't sympathize with a person's condition, but it is to say that *acceptance* reduces our instincts warning us about a person.

In ***Gut Check***, I detailed this instinctual awareness as a reason why we get jealous or possessive of our mates:

*"Whenever you feel something isn't right in your gut,
your subconscious awareness alerts you to*

inconsistencies around you. We ignore these signs because our rational mind 'knows better.' Things aren't what they seem. It tells us, "it's not as bad as you imagine." You can even feel shame or guilt for acknowledging that lack of trust.

However, this rationalization keeps us blind to the obvious that our subconscious is trying to warn us about. Humans are creatures of habit with an insatiable need to see familiarity in other people's actions. So when that predictable behavior changes even marginally, our instinctual perceptions fire off all kinds of warnings. Some of which can affect us physically."

The dynamic of *Mate Guarding* is a behavioral adaptation evolved to ensure our paternity (men) or parental investment (women) with a mate. Our social order teaches that men who feel jealousy, suspect infidelity, or are prone to mate guard are "*insecure in their masculinity.*" Redefining jealousy covers women's control of hypergamy, hoping that men will self-police these instincts. In doing so, they become sublimated. We are self-convinced that it's wrong to heed what our hindbrain tells us for our preservation.

However, when it comes to women's *intuition*, we exaggerate their importance beyond all measure. We prioritize women's hindbrain perception and **feeling** above all else. We could never downplay the importance of *feminine intuition* without risking a lot of backlashes. Whereas men's instincts are signs of "insecurity," women's instincts (**feminine intuition**) are raised to a magical level. Thus, when a woman says a guy "**creeps her out**" or is acting "creepy," we misinterpret what her hindbrain is telling her and us.

There are two aspects of "creepy" to women:

- The sense of self-preservation and imminent danger associated with a man her hindbrain registers as “there’s something not right about him.” The guy is directly or sub-communicating. He may be a potential threat to her wellbeing. Her *intuition* is exaggerated beyond realistic perception, but her subconscious only knows what it knows. The social conditioning kicks in to be overly cautious. This may or may not be the case, but women evolved to err on the side of over-cautiousness, particularly regarding men’s behavioral cues and *perceptions of anger*.
- **Creepy is an insult to Hypergamy.** A Beta male presuming to approach her makes her feel “creeped out.” In this sense, the “creep” offends her hindbrain’s expectation of reproducing with the best genetic partner she can attract. When a physically arousing man displays the same behavior as a less-arousing man, the feeling of “creep” is diminished. This is due to the guy’s sense of congruency between his behavior (sub-communications) and her intuition about his authenticity. The initial “*hotness*” of one man vs. a less hot one can be the difference between “creep” and “awkward-but-cute.” Arousal compensates for a lot of behavioral miscues. The sense of “creepiness” is fundamentally based on a woman’s feeling of losing direct control of the sexual selection and her capacity to optimize it. ‘Creepy’ distills down to a woman’s Hypergamy-level hatred of a man presuming he’s someone she **would** eventually have sex with.

In these instances, it’s important to remember we’re talking about an instinctual dynamic **and** how it’s been

modified by our social order. The following are a few of the most common descriptions of “creepy” I received from women in researching this:

“Getting in my personal space when I don’t know/barely know you. It’s weird and uncomfortable, and it can feel quite intimidating if you’re bigger than me.

When I worked in a bar, one guy told me I was prettier than anyone else. But he kept going on about how they weren’t attractive and had nothing to offer as far as looks go. Yeah? Some of those are my dearest friends you’re bashing.

When I make it clear I’m not interested, he keeps trying. It makes me feel uncomfortable and puts me in a bad position cause there are only so many times you can politely turn someone down.”

Over Persistence

In so much of our entertainment, the storyline involves a man “*winning*” an initially uninterested woman either by wooing her directly or performing some incredible feat. This archetypal story has been around for centuries. Persistence is rewarded in *Disney* Blue Pill fantasies, and everyone is the hero of their own story. If you’re raised on stories like *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, you won’t take an initial “**no**” for an answer.

It’s all part of the story. You’re the hero, and you want her, so you’ll get her in the end. Persistence is a sensitive topic in the ‘sphere. Guys will tell you that a woman is only a conversation away from being into you even without Indicators of Interest – if your Game is good enough to convince her.

Others will tell you to balance your efforts and play to your strengths. Don’t waste time. Why bother with a dead-end when other opportunities are available? In either case, a guy *can* come off as **creepy** when he takes persistence to the extreme. It’s one thing to not “take a hint” from a woman; it’s an order of degree worse when a guy persists in not taking that hint because he’s been taught he’ll be rewarded for that persistence.

I have had the “attempts-at-polite-rejection” turn scary (thankfully, the worst it ever got was being slammed into a wall) enough times that as soon as someone doesn’t take “no” for an answer once, I start internally freaking out.

After a woman rejects a guy, persistence is the top complaint of creepiness. Women expect a guy to “*just get it.*” Social retardation (in a clinical sense) and Blue Pill conditioning teach a guy never to give up. Some believe in predestination or romantic **soul-mate** date with fate, and all he needs to do is be persistent, play the long game, and

a woman will come to the same romantic-but-logical conclusion.

Women make the mistake of believing all guys *get it* when they are communicating rejection to them. But very often don't, and they've been taught to be zealously persistent for the same reason. The Blue Pill makes them resistant to *getting the hint*. Blue Pill "**creeps**" usually respond with anger or self-pity when realizing their predestined girl not only rejects him but she's scared of him or despises him.

So, the **Nice Guy** turns mean and vindictive. He loses faith in his Blue Pill romanticism and gets despondent. God forbid that guy finds the *Black Pill* at this point. Both can make for a potentially volatile Beta.

Well-meaning Beta "Nice Guys" come off as creepy because they follow a Blue Pill old order script. They believe women will reward their persistence. **Creepiness** results from their inability to do a realistic assessment of their SMV. This insight is brutal even for Red Pill-aware men, but for Blue Pill guys, it's almost impossible. They struggle against social conditioning that constantly tells them what they do and who they should be enough for any girl who's of **quality** to appreciate their perseverance.

In a way, it's like today's women's egos are being overinflated by social media to believe their own SMV is enough for any man. Especially men who are well above their sexual market value. So too does the '**creep**' believe his pathological self-impression. The problem is men are expected to be the initiators, and with that comes the potential to be taken as an aggressor or harasser.

Over-Sexualizing

A potentially harmful outcome for the *creep* arises when he watches a *Dating Coach* run through a set and then tries to repeat the same behaviors and script with a girl he thinks he may have a chance with. When a PUA presumes familiarity with a woman - and his internal game is congruent with his delivery - it is authentic and (potentially) endearing.

But, when a Beta *creep* presumes the same behavior will endear him to a girl - and isn't congruent or doesn't "**get it**" - he becomes more frustrated and aggravated when it reinforces his perception of creepiness. A typical Game technique is to presume a familiarity with a woman. When PUA with Game and congruency approaches a woman and says, "**where's my hug?**" the effect is the polar opposite when an incongruent Beta delivers the same line.

Worse still, the guy risks not just overt rejection and creepiness perception, but he also runs the risk of having his approach considered sexual assault. What would otherwise be regarded as witty banter from a skilled Player is **creepy** to women when it comes from a floundering Beta that a woman never found arousing.

This dynamic extends to **over-sexualizing a conversation** with women when no context has been established between the *creep* and the girl.

"I get creeped out by guys who immediately start talking about sexual topics in response to everything you say every time you are within communicating distance. At the same time, you two barely know each other to drop a 'hint.' I had a guy that found a way (albeit poorly) to turn everything I said into

something sexual. And whenever I called him out on it and told him to knock it off, I was being a 'prude.'"

Also, asking personal (sexual) questions or sharing stories of the same, especially if you're not even casual acquaintances. I know a lot of women who want to be polite but are creeped out by this.

What's fascinating about the sex-conversation *creep* is that when a woman initiates sexualized conversation, there's no better indicator she's into having sex with you. Women's sexual agency is perishable. Hypergamy cannot afford to have a high-value man confused about her sexual interest in him.

Consider that, when a woman immediately presumes a sexual context in conversation, it's a solid confirmation that you've passed (or are passing) her Hypergamous filter. Congratulations, you got past her initial arousal vetting. However, the nature of the over-sexualizing *creep* means he presumes a state of sexual-ness without having passed this arousal vetting.

Remember, women don't decide in the first five minutes of meeting a guy if they *will* have sex with him; instead, she knows if she *won't* have sex with him.

Game sometimes reinforces an idea that a guy needs to establish a sexual context with a woman from the opening, but the *creep* doesn't understand the artistry and nuance that applies to this. My old friend, **Alan Roger Currie**, is a big proponent of straight-up, "***I wanna fuck you, are you down?***" style of Direct Game. This Game strategy can be effective, but it does promote the idea that a guy can presume a sexual context with *any* woman from the outset.

That's not what **Alan's Mode One** tactics teach, but it is what some guys misinterpret it as. When a *creep* tries to drop *hints* about sex or attempts to get personal information in a blunderingly obvious way, he's not

employing Direct Game - he's beating around the bush hoping that he'll pass her sex test. If a *creep* fails, any attempt at "*Hey girl, are you down to fuck?*" and presuming the sale is a recipe for *creepy* harassment.

When a less-than-proficient, less-than-arousing Beta adopts this ***direct-but-not-directness***, he risks being perceived as *creepy* or a harasser. The obvious retort for a mature, socially savvy man is, "*Well, no guy should presume anything; there needs to be some kind of rapport.*" Remember, we're talking about guys who, in large part, *Don't Get It*. They don't know they're being ***creepy***.

The Slow Creep

Just so we're clear here, yes, I get that there are many ways to take the term "**creepy**." This feeling is modified by where a man is stationed in a woman's perception of his sexual market value. That said, there's a fast *creep*, and there's a slow *creep*:

"Creeps are just guys that go from 0-100 in sexualizing a conversation with a woman way too fast. A good PUA knows that slow and steady sexualization works best."

- RooshV

Take that how you want, but sexual acceleration is part of the *creep* dynamic. There's more to being creepy than overly fast sexualization (via presumed familiarity); we've got to account for a Blue Pill/Beta guy's lack of social intelligence. We assume **taking it slow** should be something he knows already. Still, how can we presume this slow and steady sexualization is an efficient form of seduction when we see more Alpha, more immediately arousing men, go from 0-100 themselves and get the same night lay?

I've done this myself back when there was no formal Game. The right guy, place, time, and 0-100 is what a woman hoped would happen. Hypergamy is nothing if not pragmatic. This over-investment - too quick, too intense - **is** the *creepy* dynamic. Beta thinking seeks to bypass Game's arousal and seduction phases and go directly to rapport.

This instant familiarity is *creepy* for women because it presumes mutual attraction far too early. It also telegraphs a guy's state of optionlessness. There's no *mystery* left

about the guy. Over-sharing is also a red flag to women's Hypergamous filters. It's an indication he doesn't understand how to play the Game **with** her.

Rushing to comfort and rapport is because that *creep* is anxious to get past the arousal phase if he recognizes it. Leveraging sexual tension and urgency is something average men have no art for. They're taught women need comfort and trust to be sexual with them, so visceral arousal is a natural source of anxiety. They misalign the *Flow* of Game: comfort, rapport, familiarity (all anti-seductive) *should* be where the sex begins his way of thinking.

Male deductive logic posits that getting comfortable and familiar as quickly as possible would lead to *meaningful sex*. When a more Alpha, natural, moves quickly, it's almost always because he's working with an aroused, receptive woman. Initial arousal compensates for many men's deficits in Game or feelings of **creepery**. Preemptively defusing that critical arousal phase and moving to comfort is shooting yourself in the foot.

Creepiness is a feeling women get from men who lack the social skills to "*just get it.*" Thus, creepiness is also a status assessment. That status builds as men persist in *gaming* women who aren't into them. This distills down to women's presuming that ***men should know better than to approach them when they are beneath their Hypergamous attraction floor.***

This creepiness assessment can happen instantly or incrementally depending on the social circumstance. The term "*creep*" can lead in different directions, but the most important one is sexual zones vs. non-sexual zones. As mentioned in the last chapter, there are many places where the presumption is women should be "free from male advances." Work, school, etc. In these zones, the margin for *creep* error is small and precarious.

Unless you are a visually attractive man with super-tight Game, your odds of being perceived as a *creep* in these zones are much higher. In sexual zones, such as the Friday night bar, the margin for error is more forgiving, as the default presumption is men are there to meet women. You still need to have the right social vibe and not come across as a weirdo, but you have more room to experiment.

I would argue that most men accused of sexual harassment (or just suspected of impropriety) are men who found themselves in environments they believed were an acceptable sexual zone. We are approaching a time when all zones will be so ambiguous that all but the most elite men will avoid every environment with sexual potential. This will have the follow-on effect of putting women into unilateral control of their own Hypergamy, but it will be a state of **Sadie Hawkins' World**.

You may be unfamiliar with a *Sadie Hawkins* dance in middle school, but to teach girl empowerment, the rules are that the girls must ask the boys to go to the dance. Yes, it's a stupid gender role swap, but it does teach an unintended lesson.

The inherent problem is that the few cute boys *every* girl in school wants to ask can only say yes to one girl. Those boys get snapped up fast by the cutest girls. The remaining girls would instead ditch the whole dance than give an average, potentially creepy boy the impression that she likes him enough to go to the dance. This arrangement leads to only a handful of cute couples going to the dance, while the unchosen *average* boys commiserate and the dejected girls grind their teeth at home.

In **Sadie Hawkins' World**, only women will be allowed to make approaches on men, and only those men who match her Hypergamous ideal – an ideal fostered and reinforced by a steady diet of social media that inflates women's egos and narrows their standards. Today, we see

precisely this *Sadie Hawkins'* arrangement viscerally play out on dating apps like *Tinder*, *Hinge*, and *Bumble*.

Our human mental firmware evolved a need to seek order in a chaotic world. Pattern recognition in humans is a selected-for trait that aided our survival in the past. We look for consistencies that help us predict and plan for eventualities. We also needed to categorize things in our environments and behavior in other people (members of our tribe vs. the members of a competing tribe, for instance). We naturally apply this need for familiarity and recognition to other people. This is how stereotypes emerged. The term “creep” is one such categorization.

“Creep” is a proxy term for a type of person that conveys that feeling we get from their predictable actions. We instinctively recognize other people’s behavior, looks, smells, sub-communications, voice intonations, etc. Subconscious pattern recognition saved our conscious minds the effort of forming an identity for every individual we meet.

Women constantly complain about the stereotypical ***Nice Guy*** turning into a “creep” when he proves his niceness was just his Game. Whether a guy is sincerely *nice* isn’t the issue. His niceness, agreeableness, and service are subject to women’s Hypergamous filtering. That filtering evolved to detect exactly this type of deception.

As I mentioned earlier, there’s nothing more flattering for women than to believe she’s figured a man out by using her *female intuition*. However, there is a flip side to this ego-compliment in women. **When her “intuitive” assessment of a man’s value, status, and intent is proven false, nothing is more offensive to a woman.** When her evaluation of a guy proves inaccurate, the *creep* vibe is at its most intense.

There are two reasons this deception is so offensive. First, optimizing Hypergamy is ultimately *dependent* on her intuition. Her long and short-term mating strategies

depend on accurately assessing men's signals and their utility to her. This assessment gets distorted by women believing the infallibility of their intuition and grossly exaggerated sense of their mating value. Second, Hypergamy cannot afford to incorrectly assess a man's status and value.

Women's sexual agency is perishable. The average woman's peak desirability spans only a decade (18-28). If a man misrepresents his true value - deliberately or by misunderstanding - women feel an offense rooted in sunk cost. The rage generated from this is palpable, even if she's wasted her time and sexual agency with a Hypergamous dead-end for just one approach.

Game Maxim #21: All Game is a form of adaptive workarounds of women's Hypergamous filtering.

This is why the Red Pill and formal Game is so disparaged by women and their patronizing male allies.

How *not* to be a Creep

When a woman typifies a guy as a *creep*, she's responding to the fallibility of her intuition. His efforts to misrepresent himself (usually unintentionally) as "something he's not" is tripping her filtering mechanism. The social dynamics of preselection and social proof are extensions of this filtering process, but the instinct triggers the *creep* feeling even with these advantages.

Women's collective social filtering aids an individual woman's selection process. The *Sisterhood* needs a type of man to represent the "**Deceiver of Hypergamy**," the *Imposter Revealed!* – enter **The Creep!**

But how do you avoid triggering the *creep* effect?

- *Don't ask about her romantic life.*
- *Don't refer to her sex life.*
- *Don't ask about the quality of the sex she's having.*
- *Don't comment that she seems like she needs to get laid.*
- *Don't tell her to lock down a guy before she gets too old and frail.*
- *Don't reassure her that "with tits like hers, she'll find a guy someday."*
- *Don't relay details of your relationship or past to comment on hers.*
- *Don't make knowing eyes when she mentions she's going on date number three.*
- *Don't tell her how to behave on a date.*
- *Don't tell her what guys like on a date.*
- *Don't tell her to wear a low-cut shirt on a date.*
- *Don't make any reference to getting lucky.*

All of these instances come from women's most common complaints of *creeps*. Again, just so we're clear, good looks, good Game, and good social calibration can mitigate *creepiness*. Most of these "*don'ts*" are sins of the approach. A savvy Player can ignore these strictures once attraction and rapport are established.

But, if you're new to Game, are working on your looks, and cannot understand social cues, it's best to keep these behaviors in mind when **initially** interacting with women. There's a lot of nuance in how a woman comes to a list of "*don'ts*." This list represents a good illustration of the ***creep dynamic***. These don'ts can all be distilled to a woman's perception of you being beneath her attraction floor, but you presume a familiar intimacy with her.

Do any of these *Don'ts* sound like actual, repeated occurrences? Through a Red Pill Lens – yes, it's entirely likely that socially awkward Blue Pill *creeps* would believe these instances are *good game*. But they are *creeps* who have no clue they're being *creepy*, and this is a dangerous world for that lack of self-awareness.

Women want lesser men to be afraid to approach, compliment and engage with them. Simultaneously, they expect Alpha men to *just get it* enough to approach them. Remember the utility of Beta men. If *creeps* have set a standard for a woman, you can use their ineptitude in Game.

A "creep" can be anyone a woman wants that guy to be – even previously attractive guys. The Alpha, who they didn't mind oversharing their sex life information, can become the "*creep*" if he decides to break things off with her. Guys most often labeled as "creep" are those with poor social awareness and men who women see as offering no real value to them.

Body language is essential to understanding this, which we'll discuss later. A woman can be duplicitous in what she says, but most can't consistently lie with their body

language. Any guy not well versed in reading the various signs of interest, or a lack of, needs to spend more time studying the basics.

A major mistake guys make is escalating too quickly. Nothing fires off the *creep* vibe more than a guy presuming familiarity when arousal isn't there. Touching (Kino) and sexualizing a woman who isn't into you, or is unsure of your value, is the quickest way to be labeled a *creep*.

How often have you seen a guy double down on an approach that isn't working, becoming known as a "creeper"? Men get into "persistence" mode and completely fuck up their chances by being overzealous.

I've got to repeat this; it's never been a more dangerous time for men to be ignorant of intersexual dynamics. Generationally, Blue Pill Beta men are acculturated to default to an older order, idealized Beta Game that is a recipe for disaster in a volatile sexual marketplace. They have no idea what their mode of interacting with women is setting them up for.

Simple compliments and treating women with default respect are liabilities for men with low social awareness. And these are precisely the type of men our social order has developed for the past four generations — average Beta "creeps" who should just know better than to try to approach the "average" woman. They result from decades of raising boys to hate their masculine nature or confuse their good intentions with some form of Game old order thinking expects women might respond to.

STRENGTH OF INTEREST

The Celebrity Maxim

Would a woman ever flake out on Brad Pitt?

Would she make Jason Momoa wait for sex?

Would she confuse Channing Tatum with “mixed messages?”

You wouldn’t fall asleep if you had a date with a swimsuit model, and you wouldn’t pull a last-minute flake text with Megan Fox, and you wouldn’t have to babysit if you had Margot Robbie ready to bang!

Three things I’ve learned from writing in the Manosphere: No matter how apt, never use an allegory to illustrate a point, never relate a fictional story, movie, or character to a real-world dynamic, and never hold up celebrities as examples of broader intersexual dynamics. The temptation to do so stems from a want for common reference.

Making a celebrity an example of a dynamic only encourages focusing on the person, not the dynamic. Don’t make the mistake of thinking a celebrity’s situation proves or disproves a point. It’s the same Apex Fallacy feminists defer to:

“....the Apex fallacy is the idea that we assign the characteristics of the highest visibility members of a group to all members of that group.”

Women misappropriate the highest visibility men to prove a norm of the “patriarchy.” Men misappropriate the highest echelon men as examples of proving or disproving Red Pill principles. Those celebs aren’t you or me. The message is usually one about incentives being strong enough to prompt behaviors.

Zero Tolerance

The problem most men have with a Zero Tolerance policy is that you're not George Clooney, and you're not Brad Pitt. Moreover, average men cling to the hopeful idealism that women will see the "real" men they think women have a magical sensitivity to detect. They hold out for the *genuine desire* they believe women should have a capacity for with them.

This is why men don't like the **3-Strikes rule** (*The Rational Male, Book 1*). Scarcity mentality colors their interaction with women. Anything counter to playing the patient, devoted, "prove-my-quality" white knight role invalidates everything they've sacrificed and waited patiently for. They're afraid of throwing the baby out with the bathwater, and damn it, if you suggest doing anything other than what makes their patience worthwhile, you're a misogynistic prick.

If average men could take a step back, they'd understand that any threshold – one strike to three strikes – suggested by me isn't about punishing a woman's indecisiveness. Instead, it's a pragmatic vetting policy for men. That tolerance policy is about conserving resources and time, not retribution. Remember, *The Medium IS the Message*:

Medium: She flakes on you with no counteroffer or marginal reframe

Message: Insufficient interest

Medium: Stops responding to communications (and possibly resumes after a period)

Message: Insufficient interest; her other options didn't pan out

Medium: Wants to bring friends to a “date”

Message: Low interest. You are a rich resource to be exploited, or her interest is so low that she foresees a need to bring friends along to make her date with you entertaining.

Game Maxim #22: *Women with high-interest levels (IL) won't confuse you.*

When a woman wants to fuck you, she'll find a way to fuck you. If she's fluctuating between being into you and then not, go *no contact* and ***spin other plates*** – this is the primary advantage of dating non-exclusively. If she sorts it out for herself and pursues you again, you are still playing in your ***Frame***. You maintained some value of your attention to her, but the interest level is still suspect.

When you patiently burn away your time wondering what the magic formula is that'll bring her around, that's when you lean over into her frame. You become the guy who *would* patiently wait for her to *come around*. You need her more than she needs you, and she will dictate the terms of her attentions.

Usually, this results from old order thinking that convinced you to qualify to her. **If a woman is your Mental Point of Origin, your relationship with her will always be in her Frame.**

From an evolutionary perspective, **Hypergamamy can't afford to wait with a *confirmed* Alpha.** Sexual opportunities with average men abound for modern women. The online global sexual marketplace is teeming with guys who confirm this for women every day.

We tend to think that women are spoiled for choice in the SMP, but their opportunities to consolidate on an Alpha man are few. So when an established high-value man rises

to the top of a woman's potential intimates, urgency and anxiety prompt rule-breaking behaviors in her.

Remember the **Cardinal Rule of Game: Women will break rules for Alpha men and create more rules for Beta men to have sexual access to her.**

When determining interest levels, keep in mind that first part; women will make access easy for a man she perceives as a high-value opportunity. Of course, this explains the *Brad Pitt Effect* mentioned above, but Hypergamy always seeks a better-than-deserved value benefit.

Game Maxim #23: *Hypergamy never seeks its own level.*

To use the apex example, a woman can't afford to confuse Channing Tatum about her interest in him. Mix in the influence a woman's ovulatory cycle predisposes her to with that **SMV+** benefit and you've got dilated pupils, sexual ornamentation (red dress, hoop earrings), lower vocal intonations, an elevated heart rate – essentially a woman primed to **break the rules for an Alpha.**

This poses a problem for average guys because, let's face it, at least 80% don't approach this apex. Even as we make dramatic leaps in self-improvement and physical transformation, it's hard to shake our former self-impressions and lack of self-confidence. In my time at *SoSuave*, we'd use the concept of ***The Prince***. It means re-imagining oneself in a new, intrinsically valuable light.

After you understand the basic psychology of why a technique like ***Cocky & Funny*** or ***Amused Mastery*** works, personally applying those dynamics requires a man to view himself in a more valuable context. He has to

believe himself to be the guy who *could* use Game successfully.

Hypergamy never seeks its own level. It always looks for a better-than deserved SMV benefit, so it follows that a man should at least reconsider himself as that “*better-than her SMV*” prospect. If that smacks of “fake it til you make it” advice, just remember, whatever *authenticity* means to you, ultimately you get to decide who you want to be. Whether that self-image is presently a reality or not is immaterial; the idea is a sound one. It’s a law of power:

Law 25 – Re-Create Yourself

Do not accept the roles that society foists on you. Re-create yourself by forging a new identity that commands attention and never bores the audience. Be the master of your image rather than letting others define it for you. Incorporate dramatic devices into your public gestures and actions – your power will be enhanced, and your character will seem larger than life.

– The 48 Laws of Power, Robert Greene

And also:

Law 34 – Be Royal in your Own Fashion: Act like a King to be treated like one

The way you carry yourself will often determine how you are treated; In the long run, appearing vulgar or common will make people disrespect you. For a king respects himself and inspires the same sentiment in others. You make yourself seem destined to wear a crown by acting regally and confident of your powers.

– The 48 Laws of Power, Robert Greene

In ***Amused Mastery***, it helps actually to **have** mastery. Asking an average guy to digest Red Pill awareness *and* reset his self-worth is a tall order. Men's existence is defined by how they deal with rejection. An average man will experience women's rejection most of his life. Telling you to adopt the mindset of a ***Prince*** is probably an alien concept to you.

Your ego was taught to be self-conscious and respectful of women's default authority. *She* decides if you're worthy based on her qualifications. Men identifying with the feminine seems like the best solution to get to the sex part. This conditioning forces compliance with women's sexual strategy. Still, it's sold on a belief that being more feminine-like, more feminine-sensitive, will set you apart from other *typical* brutish men who aren't.

With this in mind, you can appreciate the degree of unlearning a Red Pill noob must do. It's difficult for guys to consider themselves a ***Prince*** when they've been taught to qualify themselves to women all their lives. Some coaches and dating gurus will call this process ***Internal Game***.

Whatever the term, it boils down to this: **you must internalize your real value to women at some stage**. This transition is the key to taking women off the proverbial pedestal you've been taught to put them on your whole life.

Qualities of The Prince(ss)

A Prince's time is valuable. By definition, his efforts and attention are vitally needed elsewhere. His time is a gift he bestows on the common woman he may be interested in. That woman's esteem is validated by having a man of **Princely** status consider her. In all of our folktales, Cinderella's ego is flattered to have a Prince's interest. It confirms that she is the type of woman a Prince would consider an intimate.

The Prince's interest in her makes her envied by other women. It proves to all there is something about her that sets her apart from other women. Her role becomes one of humbling gratitude and excited, almost childlike, the anticipation of him. She appreciates his value because it is so evident.

It is the **Qualities of the Prince** that you must internalize. Adopting **Princely** behaviors (in Game, displaying higher value) will only benefit you as long as they are congruent with your belief that you are a Prince. To illustrate the concept of *congruency*, let's look at the example of an actual **Prince**.

Before Prince Harry married Meghan Markle, he was somewhat a stereotypical *Chad*. He enjoyed the genuine interest of many young women while he was in school and the military. He had the benefit of confirmed status, social proof, and preselection. Perceptually, other men wanted to be him, and other women wanted to bang him.

Fast forward to just a year after his marriage to an aging narcissistic divorcé, Meghan Markle, and we can see all his status crumble. Harry is a shell of a man now, more like an idiot son to an overburdened mother. But it wasn't Meghan who dethroned Harry as a Prince; it was his incongruity with *being* a Prince.

Today, Harry serves as a warning of the consequences of misaligning high status (arousal and attraction) with authentic personality. His self is incongruent with what we expect a Prince to be.

You must *be* a Prince. If that sounds like an unbelievable motivational screed, it's because average men are conditioned for the role of expectant, respectful, and deferring lover *if* they can perform to a woman's standards. Average men are taught the lie of the Blank Slate.

Everyone is *equal* (or should be considered so). Thus, women are co-equal, co-rational agents to the same degree as men. However, life experience teaches this isn't the case. Men are dumbfounded by a woman who compulsively returns again and again to the Alpha 'asshole' who doesn't respect, appreciate or love her like ***she deserves*** – like *he* would if she'd just come to her senses.

We call that guy the ***emotional tampon***, but he doesn't get that women *never* make consciously rational decisions in their emotional investments.

Women are calculating when optimizing Hypergamy, but this calculating is set on autopilot. The patterns are there. The strategy is understandable, even predictable, but few women have the insight to acknowledge it. They can't explain why they feel the way they do; you're just supposed to respect the authority of emotion.

The truth is that insight is not in their ego's best interest. It exposes the game, and women would rather play the game than have the game explained to them. Instead, women create elaborate rationalizations for not being able to help to feel the way they do. This is why *feels before reals* are the order of society today. In a world where women make the rules, emotion has authority over reason.

Even when valuation is perceptual, women's mating strategy predisposes them to want to lock a Prince down. Women's sexual agency has a shelf-life, and Hypergamy

cannot miss an opportunity to maximize that agency. Women's long-term security is dependent on maximizing these opportunities at a time in her life when she's best able to do so.

So, this is the danger of relying on apex examples of the attraction dynamic. Women, and men, must still operate within their respective Frames. However, women must work within their ability to accurately evaluate the SMV of the men they can ***realistically*** attract. That semi-abusive Jerk boyfriend she loves so much? He's not Channing Tatum or Brad Pitt, but contextually he's the guy with the strength of *her* interest.

Signaling Interest

So, how does a Player determine a woman's strength of interest? First, we'll need to make a distinction. In Game terms, **an IOI is an Indicator Of Interest**. More acronyms, I know, but IOI is a useful one. It's the Swiss Army Knife of arousal and attraction. In an approach, it applies to flirtation, physical cues, verbal cues, conversational cues, and a woman's general attitude towards you. Determining interest level in the approach stage is one of the worst problems new Players have.

Many social scientists will quote studies showing that men overestimate women's interest while women underestimate men's interest. Usually, this *old* data gets trotted out to prove how men's egos predispose them to stalking, harassment, or just measuring their dicks with other guys.

Infield pickup coaches of the past 20+ years will tell you another story. Men of the past three generations have no idea what an IOI is. Most are taught to carefully weigh the *mixed messages* a woman is sending them at the risk of being considered a *creep*.

Blue Pill men are raised from birth never to be presumptuous of women's intent. So, it's unseemly for any guy to analyze or systemize what women say and do when they're interested in fucking you. Men may self-report exaggerated interest from women in a college psychology experiment, but in the trenches of the sexual marketplace, the opposite is true.

Indicators of Interests (IOIs) can include any combination of the following:

Unsolicited Kino

This is a good sign. Some women are just *touchers* – women who emphasize their conversations with a casual touch or gesticulating that includes passive touching. Physical contact is a good sign either way. A playful punch to the bicep to exaggerate feigned offense (“Oh you!”) is part of the Big Brother/Bratty Sister dynamic. Please don’t take it as confirmation of desire, but it indicates that the dynamic is in play, and she’s somewhat interested. A play-punch to the bicep, chest, or mid-section touching is her sampling the merchandise.

Guys with a good physique instinctively come to understand what this means. That’s a good IOI, but you have to read the behavior in the context of the conversation you’re having. Women are innately hypersensitive to sending the wrong message of interest to guys because of the *creep* dynamic. Unwanted physical contact is at the top of every woman’s sexual harassment list. In light of this, a woman initiating Kino with a man is generally an overt indication of interest.

Facial focus concentration

She can't take her eyes off of you. Eye's dilated, held wider, looking you up and down, are obvious IOIs. They are meant to be noticeable. A woman who's *really* into you won't confuse you. This IOI is a "gimme." It's how older women look at a Chippendales dancer. This concentration effect intensifies for every head-height taller you are than the woman. Height is sexy. If a woman has to focus on you while looking up at you, so much the better. I know that can't be for every guy, but it is what it is.

Body positioning

A less obvious IOI. Women will subconsciously reposition themselves to take up your focal field while posing to their maximum arousal advantage. Look at any girl's Instagram shots where she's in a bikini or something sexy. Posing for women is a science now. These shots are curated from dozens of other pics shot at that time that *didn't have a look she wanted*. That *look* is the one that best displays her most prominent physical features while simultaneously blocking out anything (or anyone) in the background that might draw attention away from them.

Women do something similar in a club or a social setting (sexual zone) for men they are attracted to. The way she positions her legs towards you, how she inclines her head, shoulders to the side vs. shoulders dead-front, demurring to a new pose as the conversation progresses, are all (adjusting for context) good IOIs. Body positioning can be a challenging read for even the best of Players. It's a good sign, but it's not a guarantee.

Sexual ornamentation

According to the research on *Ovulatory Shift*, women seek out sexual opportunities in the proliferative phase of their menstrual cycle. This is roughly the seven days leading up to, and including, the point ovulation in women. In this phase, women's *proceptivity* to sex manifests in their dress, ornamentation, vocal intonation, scent, and other behaviors.

In terms of IOIs, the savvy Player knows what the form-fitting red cocktail dress and hoop earrings mean – ovulation. Ornamentation is anything that qualifies as a visual indicator of a woman in this phase. The average woman's Instagram images are a museum of ornamentation, which effectively amounts to advertising her sexual viability and availability.

Men are innately predisposed to interpreting ornamentation as a sign of sexual interest – even when the likelihood of a hookup is remote. It's precisely this interpretation that gets socially awkward men into a lot of *creep* trouble.

If your new Tinder date shows up in a tight-fitting, low-cut midriff with lingerie under it, odds are it's a strong IOI. If one of your plates' usual dress is basic college girl attire and she shows up for coffee in ornamentation, it's a good IOI. A defining feature of a *sexual zone* is women tend to dress for the possibility of sex. However, this isn't to say she **wore it for you**.

But, the potential is she uses that ornamentation as a tool for an IOI when you meet her. There is a contextual element to ornamentation. Research shows over 50% of women admit to attempting to poach another woman's partner, and over 80% of men admit to having been the object of another woman's poaching (e.g., *Schmitt et al.*,

2004; Schmitt & Buss, 2001). In those instances, women universally use some form of sexual ornamentation to signal interest to the man they poach. Context is king, but it's best to interpret it as an IOI if a woman shifts her look only around you.

Conversation cues and vocal intonation

Now, we get into the nuanced IOIs. Get this in your head now... *Not every sexual inference is an indicator of interest.* Early PUAs used to peg the sexualization of conversation as an IOI. It was a cue to escalate with a woman back in the day. Today's women are used to a desensitized, overt sexualization in communicating. You'll see it in every post on their social media, DMs, and the Tinder replies from thousands of men.

If a woman initiates sexualizing a conversation, make a mental note of it, but do not presume it's an IOI. Again, context is king, but her sexual vernacular may result from years of online interaction. An overeagerness to amplify that sexualization can push you into *creep* territory. The old PUAs used to promote the idea that if a woman gets sexual in her conversation, it was a good bet she was imagining having sex with you. This can be a valuable tool for a Player who interprets it correctly.

Overt conversational shit testing is an excellent IOI. Women who are indifferent to you won't shit test you. See the chapter on *Shit Tests* to get an idea of how to respond, but in IOI terms, shit tests are an opportunity to communicate you know how to **play** with her. Conversational cues that aren't overt tests are usually delivered as personal questions. Rarely do women direct questions at men they aren't interested in.

Women would rather be questioned because it's an opportunity to talk about themselves. Women are innately solipsistic. Players using open-ended questions and conversations directed at women is old school Game 101. But when women initiate an overt interest in you, probing for likes, dislikes, past experiences, background, personal

interests, etc., it's evidence of an interest that bypasses this innate me-first solipsism.

Vocal tone is also low-meter IOI in certain situations. Research shows that women amid *Ovulatory Shift* tend to lower their voices to the *husky* frequency. This is the sultry, sexy-voice women exaggerate when they're interested in a guy. It seems ridiculous, and women will actually parody it to belittle men in comedy skits.

However, it's only a *thing* because the phenomenon is real, and men instinctively respond to it as a sexual cue. Usually, it's so subtle men never realize the voice is different, but your peripheral awareness registers it. A skilled Player can make a mental note of the *voice*. If it is organic and directed at him, it can be a strong IOI.

Possible IOIs to consider:

- Reinitiates conversation when you stop talking
- Giggles naturally
- Fluidly builds familiarity with you
- Repeats eye contact with you
- The ubiquitous *hair toss* or some other gesture to get you to look
- You catch her smiling at you
- The under-lip bite (this is a powerful *Alpha Tell*)
- She interrupts your conversation with other women
- Brushing against you
- Casually initiates conversation
- Directly asks your name or age (always make her guess)
- She compliments you
- Playfully challenges you (shit test, strong IOI)
- Disagrees but laughs (shit test, strong IOI)
- Asks if you have a girlfriend or mentions your girlfriend without knowing if you have one

- (this is a reverse *Boyfriend Disclaimer*)
- Goes to the bathroom and comes back.
- Spontaneously shares something you like (sports team, band, artist, hobby, etc.)
- Asks for your help with learning something (not a service request)
- Approval seeking behavior – watches your reaction
- Sideways glances
- Actively introduces you to her friends (social proof)
- Overtly announces or returns to tell you she's leaving (follow invitation)
- Asks you where you are going next
- Invents reasons to be near you

Game Maxim #24: *Good Game doesn't Guarantee Interest.*

So, you're talking to a girl, and for whatever reason, you're in a good state, and she's getting your absolute best Game. You're in the zone, holding back from laughing at jokes you can't believe are coming out of your mouth. She's laughing and smiling and, by all indications, loving it.

But then the conversation dies abruptly. She doesn't give you a chance to close her in any way. She didn't ask you a single question. She didn't engage you or encourage you. ***She wasn't interested; she was disinterested.***

The following are indicators of disinterest:

- General avoidance: Eye contact. Flakes on dates. Ignores texts
- Pretends she didn't hear what you just said or read your texts
- Kills conversation or is non-responsive
- Noticeably impatient (abort your approach)

- Walks away or ahead of you
- Leans out (see *Body Language*)
- Makes an effort to talk to someone else
- Repetitively says "uh-huh"
- Won't follow you

In these instances, average men default to rationalizations. She has a boyfriend. You're the opposite of her physical type, etc. That could be the case, but the truth is even the best Game will not ***always*** work. In fact, it will initially fail more often than not.

Game is not meant for those do-or-die moments where you ***must*** succeed. If you're learning Game because it's an existential necessity to find your ***soulmate***, you're using it incorrectly. It's not a 100-meter sprint where years of training go into that one all-important race.

It's more like poker, trudging along with one hand at a time. Even the best players lose more than they win. Game is a skill that increases your chances of getting more and better in the long run at the cost of sustaining short-term "losses" that teach you what you need to know. Determining the strength of a woman's interest is one important lesson.

LOOKS - THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PHYSICAL

Game Maxim #25: *Your charming personality and bulletproof Game won't make you look any better when your shirt comes off. Looks count.*

Women's physical standards for men far exceed any standards men might have for women.

"M*en have impossibly high beauty standards!"* Have you ever heard this come from a woman? Maybe "*Society tells men they should want fake bikini models*" is more familiar?

This may come as a shock, but it is, in fact, women who have a much higher standard of idealized male beauty than men will ever hold for women. For all the endless complaints of men wanting "living barbie dolls" and *beauty* being a social construct, men have much more flexible beauty standards and variance in their sexual selectivity than women.

Men readily adjust their physical "preferences" to align with what has proven sexually *expedient* for them in the past. In other words, men tend to prefer and return to the *sure thing*. These preferences of convenience manifest themselves as "fetishes" for men - and you don't need much extensive research to prove this.

Just search the wide variety of internet porn catering to the physical attributes men fetishize. Big boobs, small boobs, big ass, tiny ass, every hair color of the rainbow, shaved snatch, hairy snatch, teen girls to MILFs and older. Tan, pale, bulimic skinny to the ubiquitous BBWs (Big Beautiful Women), men evolved to be less discerning and

more open to variety in solving their reproductive problems.

Name the physical attribute(s), and there's a fan group just waiting to bang that type of girl. The old internet *Rule 34* was never more evident than in men's willingness to fuck damn near any physical demographic of women – ask the female midgets catering to that fetish of porn.

On the other hand, from a purely physical perspective, women's idealized masculine beauty hasn't changed in millennia. While there may have been *Rubenesque* periods when men loved the fatties of the 1600's, no such era has **ever** existed for women's physical preferences in men.

The classic broad chest, wide shoulders, six-pack abs, v-taper, and squared jawlines of Greco-Roman athleticism are still the idealized male form that graces the cover of every romance novel.

I'm still waiting for someone to link me to a dating site that caters exclusively to women's fetish for Big Beautiful Men (BBM) – average to good-looking, fit women specifically seeking overweight men to date. ***Executive Introductions.com*** caters to women seeking affluent, influential, high-value men. But women just looking for chubby men? That dating site doesn't exist. Polls show that even overweight to obese women don't find overweight men attractive.

Don't think I'm refuting the prevailing bio-mechanics that prompt men towards the sexual want of young, slender, fertile, and archetypically sexy women. That's hardwired for us. It highlights women's bitching about men's perception of beauty, sexual objectification, and how unfair it is to be measured in the physical as a basis for their worth.

Historically speaking, women got it easy when it came to physicality. Unless she's an *extreme* outlier, there's probably a niche of porn that caters explicitly to every woman's physique. In terms of effort, it takes far more sweat and determination for a man to build his body into that masculine ideal than it will ever be for women to achieve a form that men won't find somewhat sexually appealing.

What does all that mean? Is Rollo saying it's all hopeless and women's physical standards are *unrealistic*?! Nope. I'm illustrating here that the reality you're dealing with has a straightforward solution...

Get your fat ass in the gym. Stay in shape.

Looks Maxers and *Neck-Chin Doomers* who think Game and money are inconsequential next to Looks should take heart here. Formal Game has **ALWAYS** factored in appearance, height, clothing, facial symmetry, and above all else, physique. The **first** advice any *coach* worth his salt should tell you is to **get in the gym**.

Working out is the one area of Game in which you have direct, immediate control. It may take months or even years to reimagine your personality and perfecting social skills that work best for you, but working on your physique is the most direct control you will have in your success with women.

Beyond the physical aspect, the Game value of the psychological effects of routine exercise can't be overstressed. The best Game gurus will tell you to get in the gym first because it creates positive feedback loops that eventually develop into confidence. You'll feel better about yourself. Exercise relieves stress, gets out aggression and angst, and puts your mind in a positive state where learning new things is easier.

Game Maxim #26: *The best form of Peacocking is having a good physique*

This is especially true in the 21st century. As of this writing, 75% of the US population is overweight. Of this population, 35% of men and 40% of women are, medically speaking, *morbidly obese*. Resist your literalist mind's attempts to question the definitions of what BMI or body fat index does or doesn't count as *overweight*. That's cope.

Realize a simpler truth; if you were a *normal* weight for your age, height, body type, etc., you would *still* be in better shape than 75% of men in the sexual marketplace. Get into an elite physical condition, and you jump from 25% to at least the 20% of men women *want* to have sex with.

Disabuse yourself of the comforting lies women (and men) tell you about women not being as concerned with looks as men. That bullshit had a point in the times before social media.

When women's mating strategies were necessarily secretive, it made sense to tell rich fat Beta men that women *don't mind a few extra pounds if he's got a good heart*. It benefitted women's long-term security interests to foster the idea that women's attraction is still genuine if a guy is pudgy.

In the age of *Open Hypergamy*, Instagram, and Darwinian sexual selection, we see this for its lie. Women *deserve* a guy who looks like a semi-pro athlete with a face and body like Henry Cavill or Michael P. Jordan.

While women are in no way ***as sexual*** as men, today they are more viscerally and visually oriented than women of previous eras would ever admit. Your girlfriend, wife, mom, grandma didn't beg to see *Aquaman* because she had a keen interest in *D.C. Comics*. She wanted to look at Jason Momoa.

Accept women's visceral nature for what it is. You will not change it with words. You will not change it with rationalizations. Accept it and use it to leverage it to your advantage. Lift weights, get in shape, and arrogantly know your value once you are in top physical form.

Looks.

Affluence.

Game.

Have two.

Three is best, but if you only have one, Game is the most essential.

Looks are a primal part of arousal and attraction – that's a fact of life – but you will never hear me say that Looks cancel Game. If you hear that Looks are the *only* thing that matters, odds are you're dealing with a *Doomer Incel*.

I advocate that learning Game is just as necessary as maintaining a good physique. Money, Muscles, and Game is the holy trifecta. When one of these is lacking, men exaggerate the other aspects.

The problem is people who can only think in absolutes. It's always an either-or proposition. Game trumps physique or physique trumps Game is horse shit. They're both essential and play off each other.

There are plenty of average-looking guys who pull tail thanks to Game despite their looks. Some good-looking guys pull tail without ever knowing what Game is. But wouldn't you rather be the guy with both Looks and Game? The guy who can pull women *without* compensating for personal deficits?

Other men will *lead with their wallets* and never realize the sex they garner from it is little more than a woman's

performance art exchanged for money. Their deficits are offset by transactional sex, but they rarely understand the difference between validational sex (genuine desire) and transactional sex (obligated compliance).

Consider those obesity stats again. It stands to reason that 75% of the guys seeking out the Red Pill to change their lives, outlook, and sexual prospects will be struggling with their weight.

Now consider guys' belief that looks matter less than personality, Game, etc., in female attraction. This is not a coincidence. It takes more effort to change their bodies than to change their minds. The first thing men who were previously out of shape will tell you is the marked increase in the attention they receive from women after they got in shape. This is the simplest experiment that puts the lie to the *looks are less important than Game* assertion.

A popular misconception men adopt is "looks aren't as important for women" and that they're more forgiving of a few extra pounds *if* a guy is witty, humorous, respectful, has Game, and embodies some combination of the prerequisites women have for men.

This is the male version of the body image acceptance social convention women have been promoting themselves for the past 50-years.

Don't worry about getting in shape; money, humor, and confidence will make any woman swoon for you. If this were the case, comedians like Louie Andersons and Danny DeVito would be swimming in top-shelf poon. I do not doubt that very rich, out-of-shape men have a relatively easy time attracting women, but they can't make a woman genuinely desire to fuck him on a physical level. This is a commercial version of negotiating desire.

Muscularity is Sexy

For a brilliant study of this, read Dr. Martie Hasselton's ***Why Muscularity is Sexy***. Researchers Martie Haselton and David Frederick asked 141 women to rate different male body types. Women's average ratings for each body type in terms of sexual attractiveness (on a scale of 1 to 9) were as follows:

1. Built: 6.97
2. Toned: 6.87
3. Brawny: 6.37
4. Slender: 5.42
5. Typical: 4.28
6. Chubby: 2.95

Note that even "slender" outranks "Typical" and "Chubby." Women also reported their short-term sexual partners were "more muscular than their long-term partners." Research suggests women have fewer qualitative requirements for muscular men. Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks. Women were more willing to have short-term relations with muscular men without the need that they demonstrate characteristics desired in long-term mates, thus confirming the ***Cardinal Rule of Game - Women break rules for Alphas and make rules for Betas.***

Researchers also asked a group of male participants about their sexual history. Controlling for age and body fat, muscular men reported greater numbers of sexual partners. Researchers also asked men about their self-esteem.

Maybe it's just mindset and muscular men just feel better about themselves? Higher-self esteem and

confidence could explain higher sexual success, but the evidence didn't support this. Muscular men, irrespective of self-esteem, had more sexual partners.

Lastly, researchers asked a different group of men, *"How many times have you had sex with a woman who had a boyfriend or husband when you had sex with her?"*

Muscular men reported more affairs with women who were in long-term relationships. Researchers also found a man's physical prowess is a better predictor of sexual success than his attractiveness. They concluded, "Men with higher physical dominance reported higher quantitative mating success."

Priorities

In accordance with women's sexual strategies, women prioritize Looks according to their phase of life. I dedicated the second book in *The Rational Male* series, *Preventive Medicine*, to detailing these phases of women's maturity and what men can generally expect. For brevity's sake, here are priorities and how the importance of characteristics that women consider for intimacy shift as their conditions change:

15 - 24 Years Old

Looks are **everything**. Some romanticism helps complete the fantasy, and Game is a factor, but the priority is primarily physical. Girls will overlook both character flaws and a lack of money in favor of fucking a 'hawt' Alpha in her sexual value peak years (22-23). What defines *Alpha* for this demographic is primarily raw, Darwinian physicality and prowess. Youth and inexperience with men make this a woman's only frame of reference for *Alpha*.

25-30 Years Old

Looks are still of primary importance, but other factors begin to compete in significance as she becomes aware of the impending *Wall*. While she's still hot enough to command attention, priorities now lean towards a man's long-term security, provisioning, and parental investment potential. Getting closer to 30, she has to play her cards well if she's to cash out of the sexual marketplace while she can compete with younger women. Ambition, character, assets, humor, personality, personal potential, etc., become more critical in the light of long-term pairing.

30-35 Years Old

Single women in this demographic are in varying states of denial. They realize they're past their expiration date, but social conventions still convince them they aren't.

Securing a long-term commitment is a more difficult battle with every passing year. *Looks* drop in priority over assets, status, and personal security. Game and personality become more imperative, but her focus is on making up for the results of her choices when she was 28.

Locking down a proven commodity – a man with relative success and status – is the goal, not a man with “**potential**” for that same success. *Post-Epiphany Phase* women have a strong incentive to look for *turnkey* relationships with high-value men. While the physical is still important, she’s willing to compromise on the physical standards she held at 24 if the man represents long-term security as her SMV decays.

35-45 Years Old

In today’s sexual marketplace, she’s well past her expiration date. She’s hit the *Wall* and must accept that she’s a *Yellowed Pearl*. All notions of requisites or priorities are a fond memory now. She may play the *Cougar* card in an ego protection effort. This may seem like she’s back to her primary Looks focus in playing the Cougar, but on some level of consciousness, she understands that younger men see her as low-hanging fruit and in no way expect more than a physical fling. The hope is to lock down a reliable Beta with at least some money. Status is nice, looks would be icing on the cake if he’s still got them, but security takes priority above Game or social intelligence.

Making the Change

Changing yourself takes an effort. The greatest obstacle in change is the first one; recognizing and accepting that you need to change. This is where average men chomp at the bit. For the better part of a lifetime, they've been told to "***just be themselves,***" and everything will go according to fate's plan. Then they unplug from the Matrix enough to realize that personal change is necessary for them. They need to change their lifestyle, attitudes, outlook, and minds about themselves and change their physiques too.

But change takes effort, and people are lazy. They want the quick fix, the magic pill that makes them happy, successful, and sexually irresistible. So they flock to guys selling the best program that promises all that for a minimum of effort.

Learning Game demands practiced effort, but it requires far less physical effort than improving one's body. It's incredibly daunting for guys unaccustomed to working out. It takes time, energy, and dedication, all commensurate with how out shape that guy is, to begin with.

Men define what is feminine and sexy for women. However, the inverse is true in that women define what is masculine and sexy for men. The reason women find particular aspects of men's physiology sexually arousing is that the men in the past who embodied them were rewarded with sex often enough to make them reproductively successful. At the same time, those traits got hard-coded into women's brains.

Game is essential, as is root level, dynamic personal change. I don't think I need to explain just how important this is. There's no end to the gloom and doom talk on Incel and *Looks Maxxing* forums and YouTube channels.

The Red Pill has *consistently* recognized **Looks Count**; looks matter. But ironically, Looks are one of the few areas of change that a man has some **direct** control over – his body. Barring physical disabilities or deformities, you have no excuse not to be in better shape. Why wouldn't you want the complete package if sexual success comes from Looks, Affluence, and Game?

Stop being so Goddamned lazy and accept that you'll need to exert some effort and sweat to make yourself more attractive. Game and a positive-masculine mindset are vital elements for your attractiveness and well-being, but they **won't** make you look any better with your shirt off.

BODY LANGUAGE

After 20 years of writing in the manosphere, I've learned that people take the issue of **Looks** very personally. Evolution engrained something in our minds to make us aware of where we fit in as far as image is concerned. That's the root of the idea of **leagues** relating to Sexual Market Value (SMV). Everyone is keenly aware of their conditions. On some level of consciousness, how we look to others is part of that awareness.

A lot goes into the simple task of dressing ourselves each day and the message we're conveying to other men, women, families, coworkers, church, etc. We all have some awareness of what we're communicating with our clothes, behaviors, and speech.

For 25 years, author Joe Navarro worked as an FBI special agent in counterintelligence and behavioral assessment. Today he is one of the world's leading experts on nonverbal communications. His books are exclusively about reading body language. I'm not sure Joe likes being affiliated with the manosphere.

Still, there's no doubt that what he's studied and written about for so long can be an invaluable tool for reading the sub-communications of women in Game applications.

In the *Learning to Read* chapter, my emphasis was on the information you can glean from your surroundings, understanding the social environment, and the sub-communications a woman might be relaying to you. We take a lot of information our brains process for granted in social settings.

Our subconscious minds push out the background noise, the less critical data, to our *peripheral awareness* so our conscious minds can focus on what we think is most important. The parts we take for granted, the information

that our subconscious processes, **can** be at least as necessary as what our consciousness is sorting out.

I'm calling attention to this process because I want to stress the importance your ***Instinctual Process*** plays in interpreting what you see concerning social interactions. More importantly, how do your instincts interpret seeing men and women interact with one another? My career in the liquor and gaming industries put me in a unique people-watching position.

I studied the unspoken communications between men and women in settings (Sexual Zones) where they're primed to apply their interpersonal skills (or lack of). However, it wasn't until I started contrasting what I saw with what I understood about behavioral psychology, Evo-psych, and the sexual strategies men and women evolved for.

I developed a honed ability to read what men and women communicate with their clothing, expressions, posture, physical positioning, etc., and interpret it with a *Red Pill Lens*. I get in trouble because people tend to take my reading into things very personally. Even if I'm reading the photograph of a couple, they know nothing about associating something in the image with how they perceive themselves.

We're taught from an early age never to "*judge a book by its cover*." We're taught it's wrong to be *judgmental*, and what's on the inside is what counts. This never sat well with me, but you risk sounding catty when you judge a person by their looks or whatever it is they're doing in a picture. They say you sound like a gossipy woman, or else it's supposedly some indication that you're *projecting* your insecurities onto whoever you're being critical of.

Our Instinctual interpretive process makes judgment calls all the time. Our hindbrains always make comparisons; it's just impolite to give voice to them. This

does nothing to help you objectively assess what sub-communications are taking place.

So, fair warning, the following principles are derived from reads on hundreds of pictures. If what I interpret seems a little self-serving or judgmental, just know I'm doing my best to stay objective.

For years, I've gotten into the habit of reading the images of various couples that guys sent me. Is this Alpha? Was that Beta? Mostly these guys wanted me to explain if what they were seeing were *Alpha Tells* or *Beta Tells* in the body language in a couple.

In most of these shots, the Beta male body language was evident, even to the untrained eye. What was less obvious was the woman's posture and sub-communications.

Leaning In

Of the hundreds of images I *read*, the most common position for men was the *lean in*. Today this is the most common *meme'd* image on the internet. Green lines superimposed over the angles of the people in the picture is a Manosphere joke now. However, this posture is something *Roissy* once called attention to as the hallmark of a Beta subconsciously manifesting his mindset in his body language. It's the body language of *Frame*.

The *lean-in* is easily identifiable. While I don't think it is **always** a *Beta Tell* (depends on context), it's certainly a starting point for other manifestations of men's scarcity mentality. What I mean by that is that the *lean-in* is a physical display that illustrates how a man's subconscious has decided that his woman's *Frame* is dominant in the relationship. He feels a subconscious compulsion to put himself into her space as his reflexive impulse.

It's essential to bear in mind that when we are photographed with women, we are, or would like to be, intimate with there's an innate understanding that anyone viewing the image will infer a relationship exists. More on this later, but keep in mind that some of these inferences will be related to *mate guarding* behaviors.

The critique of this *lean-in* is usually "*Well, that's just that one-shot*" or "*The photographer told him to lean in.*" I can only say that the predominance of couples shots, candid and staged alike, most consistently pose a man as the *leaner*. This may also reflect the photographer's reflexive preference to pose the man in a submissive position.

So, while you may hold *Frame* in your relationship, the person taking the photo may well believe a man ought to *lean in* to defer power to the woman in the shot.

Leaning Out

The counter to *leaning-in* is a woman leaning out or away from the man. It's as if there's a conflict of hindbrains going on. Average men lean in to find inclusion and acceptance in a woman's *Frame*, while a woman's hindbrain instinctively reacts by attempting to lessen the inference that the guy might be her boyfriend. In these instances, the message a woman's hindbrain conveys is almost "***Get him offa me!***" but with a sheepish smile so as not to be too obvious. You'll also notice a woman's free hand gestures to push away from the guy in lean-out images.

We rationalize this as a gesture of affection, but in the context of these shots, the unspoken message is a defense against the man's *lean-in*. This is one more manifestation of a war between the couple's subconscious. Leaning away from a man or putting space between herself and him while directly gazing at the camera (really the viewer), we're meant to presume she's more interested in us than him.

The Eyes Have It

It's important to pay attention to women's facial expressions in their photos. Notice the commonalities in gaze direction and the message their eyes and expressions communicate (sub). Women are keenly aware of the permanence of an image and what that image conveys. Women's brains innately give them a much fuller capacity for communication, and a sensitivity to nuances, than men.

Men prioritize the content (information) of communication while women prioritize communication context (feeling). All imagery communicates something to us. We have to consider this truth when we analyze women's expressions and physical communication in photos.

I joked with a guy who sent me an image of a woman staring intently at the camera, one hand poised to push away her boyfriend, nesting his head into her neck and hair. I said, "She looks like she wants to bang me, not the guy doting on her." There's more than a bit of truth in that read. Women today are hyperaware of how an image can be used to facilitate or handicap their sexual strategy.

It's no casual accident when a woman directs her attention towards the viewer. It's not the person behind the camera that she has in mind when she knows she is being photographed; it's the potential audience - an audience that's grown global in the age of social media.

A woman's focus is on how any viewer will perceive her. In other images I was sent, the woman focused on *anything* other than the men in the shot, whose only focus was her. It's a common understanding in advertising that when two or more people appear in an ad, the one with the presumed dominance is always looking away or out at the viewer.

The submissive party is the one whose attention is directed at the dominant person. The dominant person is the one *telling the story* in the ad. This was a complaint amongst 70s era feminists about magazine ads. Women were *disempowered* by being posed in subservient positions where they focused on a man in the ad. The only exception to this was in what feminists still refer to as the *Male Gaze*. The dominance a woman held limited her capacity to grab the attention of men in the ad and the men viewing the ad.

These concepts are an interesting contrast to the millions of photos girls and women post of themselves on social media every day. Think of the gender power dynamics in women's Instagram pictures. It may seem like I'm splitting hairs here. Still, the reflexive impulse a majority of women default to is one of advertising themselves for potentially better options in the sexual marketplace.

Whether this is a practiced or unconscious tact, the purpose of women's automatic physical responses to their man's *Beta Tells* is to advertise their sexual availability. Some guys think women default to these expressions due to ego aggrandizement. I'm willing to accept that there's an element of egoism (certainly solipsism). Women enjoy the envious attentions of other women on Instagram. However, these 'ego shots' universally focus on the woman in the power dynamic.

Mate Guarding

Another common *Beta Tell* is the *death grip pose* men will opt for in their couple's photos. This is where the man locks an arm around his woman (the arm-bar) or drapes an interposing forearm between the viewer and the woman who's coyly trying to escape his mate guarding message. The woman often has her hand on his hand as if trying to pry him off.

It seems like a reciprocation of affection – similar to the hand on the chest pushing him away. *Death grip* or the *Arm Bar* is a clingy positioning. The battle between his and her subconscious centers on the guy mate guarding and her subconscious desire to broadcast her sexual availability despite him.

I Love Mommy

In most of these images, the male is focused intently on the woman. This manifests how these men are conditioned to make their women their ***Mental Point of Origin***. Even in the images where the man is looking at the camera, his sub-communication is one of deference to or guarding his most important priority.

A trend I've seen in a couple's photos is what I've dubbed the *I Love Mommy* pose. In these shots, the man assumes an almost childlike position of kissing his woman.

I could probably dedicate an essay to all of the psychological implications of this phenomenon. One critic on Twitter asked me if I genuinely thought this tendency was due to men's unresolved issues with their mothers. It wasn't until later he admitted *he* tended to do the same and was honestly concerned about it.

I'm sure the possibility exists. More importantly, this habit manifests in men who invest themselves in the myth that vulnerability is endearing to women. A persistent lie accompanies the vulnerability myth. That's the lie that men can let their guard down and 'relax' around the woman they *feel* securely paired with.

So, what do men do when they "*let their guard down*"? They mentally revert to the boy who never needs to qualify himself for his mother's love. They regress to a subconscious comfort in *vulnerability* they believe will endear them to women. They communicate this in the *I Love Mommy* pose.

How do you suppose a woman's hindbrain imperative for Hypergamy will perceive this habit? How do women instinctively interpret this look in the Instagram generation? I expect it's one of disgust, apprehension, and resistance. Nothing turns a woman off more than a man

telegraphing that he'd rather be her child than her lover or husband.

"I Love Mommy" communicates that a man's romantic concept of love begs women to intimately accept him apart from his *Burden of Performance* - the antithesis of her qualification-based Hypergamy. Wives often complain that their husbands are like *"having another kid in the house."* The men they married are liabilities, resource sinks, and another mouth to feed, not unlike their children. Their beliefs in pop-egalitarianism won't permit them to become men. This belief is manifested in their reflexive postures with their girlfriends and wives.

Alpha Tells

If all of this reads like the overly-critical projection and nitpicking critics will accuse me of, allow me to present some Alpha sub-communications examples. Finding examples of these images can be a tall order in an age where any man not entirely focused on his woman risks being “*toxically*” masculine. Men who are confident enough to communicate their *mental point of origin* are accused of arrogance or narcissism. But as you’ll see, this isn’t a bad thing.

In couples photos, the best example of Alpha Tells focuses on the man being the center of importance in the shot. If you look up images of actor Vincent Cassel and his wife Tina Kunakey, you’ll see many Alpha Tells.

No doubt haters will come up with a reason why Vince doesn’t align with their definition of Alpha. Still, these images illustrate the opposite of Beta sub-communications for our purposes. Try to look past the celebrity and see the Alpha male deference on display.

You’ll notice Tina’s focus of attention is *always* on Vince. Women who hold genuine admiration for their men consistently make them the story in photos. The association with a demonstrably high-value man is ego-affirming for women. Even in shots where they look at each other, her focus is on him. It’s not difficult to assess the power dynamic in their relationship, but you can also feel a genuine desire emanating from Tina.

Women who genuinely admire their men are unconcerned that their posture in a shot might be read as subservient or ego-abasing by women’s *audience*. A woman’s attention from a confirmed Alpha is far more validating than any lower quality attention she might temporarily enjoy by appeasing her audience. Remember,

attention is the coin of the realm in Girl World, but that attention is measured in quality, not quantity. Easily had attention is next to worthless, but the attention of a high-value man gratifies women's egos.

Much of this observation is rooted in the *Desire Dynamic*. You cannot negotiate genuine desire, but it's nearly impossible for women to repress it once that desire exists consciously. Hypergamy cannot afford to have a high SMV man be confused about her passion or motives.

A woman who is proud of the association with the man she's paired with is less concerned about the perception other women might have of her actions. She'll convert any disparaging opinion of them into a point of pride if that man is above her sexual market value. Gone are any concerns of giving her public the appearance of still being on the market in her social media images.

When a little girl thinks a little boy on the playground is cute, her reflexive response isn't something she had to learn. This attraction response is often reflected in the expressions of adult women when the presence of an attractive man connects with her hindbrain.

The biting of the lip, the beaming admiration, the laser eye focus, and the hopeful smile followed by a coy embarrassment in realizing what she's doing when she regains her composure. These are the physical cues of a woman whose only concern is the man she's with.

Contrast these signals with the Beta *tells* where men are the hangers-on of the women in their photos. A natural Alpha is seldom aware of his own Alpha-ness's effect on women. That's what stands out in Alpha Tells shots. The men aren't **trying** to evoke the reflexive responses of the women. They effortlessly fluidly (almost Zen-like) prompt these reactions in women.

There is no pretense. There is no apparent mugging for the audience that you see in shots where the *Frame* is directed to the woman. The hapless Beta tries to prove how

in love he is by kissing her while she finds something more interesting to occupy herself with. When a woman admires her man, he is all she can think about – and thus all she can see.

I'm aware that all of this will come off as self-serving. *Only bitches care about how they look in a picture!* It's impossible to objectively interpret body language without someone resorting to *point & sputter* insults about how they think you're just being petty or jealous of some celebrity's life.

The discouraging of anyone attempting to understand sub-communications only serve the party with the most to gain from a larger ignorance. I hope this breakdown has provided valuable references to gauge your own, or your woman's, default behavior when the cellphone cams come out at a party.

Finally, resist the impulse to beat yourself up over what your body language betrayed about you in the past. Whenever I discuss body language on a podcast or workshop, the first thing guys do is pore over their photos on Instagram or their archives. They send me countless pictures from when they were with an ex-girlfriend or some chick they were rejected by and ask, "*Was this Beta of me?*"

They all start looking for *tells* that might have led to the demise of their relationships. I rarely answer these emails for two reasons. Without the context of the relationship, I can't make that read for you – and honestly, you know better than I do. I'm generally explaining what you already know.

Two, it doesn't matter. That was then, and this is now. You're not going to recover a failed relationship by re-staging the moment in your head. You currently accurately assess the *tells* you're showing and how they're interpreted. Act accordingly. Read her *tells* accurately. **The Medium is the Message.** Understand the *tells*, and you understand the message.

INDIGNATION

Game Maxim #27: *In the absence of indignation, women will actively manufacture it for themselves.*

Have you ever lost your cool with a woman? Have you ever gotten to the point of exasperation where you just said “**enough!**” Most guys think that losing emotional control is some failure as a man. While stoicism has its place, there are many Game virtues of a *man losing his cool*. This is an interesting concept from a behavioral psychology perspective. A tactical putting down of one’s foot unexpectedly rattles comfortable, predictable behavioral patterns women come to expect from their men.

Often enough, women will try to provoke it in their men to test whether he can call her out. When controlled and used tactically, a flash of Alpha can reinvigorate a woman’s failing interest. However, for it to be effective, you already need to have established a relationship to the point that doing something unexpected conflicts with a set expectation of behavior from you. If a woman doesn’t know your character, “losing your cool” will make you seem pouty, erratic, or unstable.

What makes this break in a routine so appealing to women’s psyches? You can argue that an outburst of feral Alpha sparks the elusive “**vagina tingle**” – and that’s a visceral effect – but indignation drives that glandular response. Women live in a constant state of conflict when it comes to security. On an evolutionary level, the security impulse is women’s prime directive.

As the *vulnerable sex*, long-term provisioning, protection, and parental investment make ‘security seeking’ a woman’s primary motivation. This isn’t to discount the influence of Alpha Fucks, the short term sexual imperatives; however, herein lies the problem:

Game Maxim #28: *The cues that fire a woman's sexual response are the same cues that conflict with her security needs.*

On the surface, women have a social responsibility to present the perception that their interests align with security. Everything should (ultimately) revolve around home, hearth, and security. But women's behaviors tell a much different story about their appetites. Women need indignation.

Watch one episode of *The Bachelorette*, and you'll get a clear picture of the value indignation holds for women. Whether the source is gossip, living vicariously through third parties, or eating it up in popular media (Daytime talk shows, romance/fan fiction media), one commonality arises:

In the absence of indignation, women will actively manufacture it for themselves.

Average men believe this need for indignation is the calling card of a "high drama" woman. The truth is, the need for *drama* is a psychological predisposition for women. **Women's biology predisposes them toward security, but they chafe in a condition of total safety.** In contemporary terms, this translates to living under the conditions of relative security while seeking out avenues to create that indignant spark.

Indignation is exciting because it stimulates women's Hypergamous filters. Nothing is more satisfying to a woman than to believe she's figured out who a man is via her *intuition*. When a woman figures this out, either in reality or in fiction, it stimulates indignation. It's the confirmation that her *intuition* still works and can avert her making bad reproductive choices by discerning a man's deceptiveness.

Indignation is a pleasurable effect on women. It is the reward for having figured a man out – a circumstance that may have been a matter of life or death in our ancestral past. However, suppose a woman has the security and familiarity of knowing who a man is for a long time. In that case, this filter goes unused, and the pleasurable indignation feelings need to be re-stimulated.

Game savvy practitioners develop measured ways to make themselves the focus of that need for indignation. Most men stumble upon the usefulness of this dynamic without realizing it. You get fed up and pissed off, either at some boundary she's crossed or some third party has, and your anger flares up. Your usually patient demeanor is gone, you go caveman, and for a brief moment, she sees the wild side of you she hoped you'd have.

Average men will tolerate far more personal affronts from their romantic interests. They want to present the appearance of humility or patience with others while she's around. It's an effort to convince her that he's a good bet as a security provider. While this may appeal to her provisioning needs, it directly conflicts with her feral, sexual instinct of physical arousal.

On a base level, average men realize they're among the 80% of men women find "*unattractive*." They believe they cannot compete on the *Alpha Fucks* side of Hypergamy, so their best bet is to play to their strengths on the *Beta Bucks* side by developing their *Game* around women's long-term security needs.

The problem with this one-sided approach is it doesn't allow for indignation. While loyalty, love, commitment, and dependability are admirable qualities in a man, they're not very exciting. The definition of *security* includes being predictable, and predictability is never arousing.

The modern-day **Karen** who impatiently demands to see a store manager or scolds someone for inconveniencing her is a woman starving for *honest* indignation. The woman

who fearlessly smacks the bouncer at a club, *knowing* that men will come to her defense, is trying to provoke indignation.

In the absence of indignation, women will create it for themselves. It's why romance novels center on outing a man for who he is and why tossing a drink in a man's face is socially permissible. From an intersexual competition perspective, men want women to disqualify their competitors. Beta Game depends on tolerating behaviors from women that would lead to violence if any man acted in such a way.

Average men don't like this reality. It's comforting to think of women's attraction as requiring less confrontation. Believing all women want a *Nice*, compassionate, loyal, and stable partner whose priority is her needs fits his only viable mating strategy. Women who are grossly overt in this need for indignation are (rightly) labeled "**Drama Queens.**" They don't consider that **all** women have this innate need for indignation. It can be a helpful tool for a man who can use it covertly and skillfully. Accepting this feminine need for indignation is the first step.

The next step is to center her indignation on yourself – instead of *The Bachelor* and gossip. An occasional, well-timed *Flash of Alpha* is all that's required to gratify this need, but be *damn sure* you're in the right about whatever issue you decide to explode upon.

Be inconsolable about something insignificant but justifiably important. Send a perfectly good plate of food back at a restaurant. Find some issue that meets your disapproval and "*let it get to you.*" If you're naturally an impatient guy, find something out of character that meets your disapproval.

The ideal message is that you have standards for yourself that aren't being met by someone or something, and you're willing to fight that disrespect. Bear in mind that these are just ideas, not specific suggestions. There's a

definite art to prompting indignation. Too overt, too out of character, and you risk being seen as childish and petty. Too subtle, too indecisive, and you start the opposite effect; you come off as meek or in need of a woman sticking up for you.

Prompting anger can help imply social proof and preselection that is often at a premium once you're in a relationship. Remember that how you go about it is contextual to you and your relationship. Some guys go so far as to deliberately initiate a breakup to trigger that anger and give their woman an emotional high. This is effective, but it is extreme.

Tactical breakups are rarely sustainable in the long term. Use them with caution. Your value dynamic must be high enough that losing you represents an opportunity cost she can't recover. Do it too many times, and it becomes an empty threat, overt manipulation, and really, a tactic for negotiating for her genuine desire.

Game Maxim #29: *Indignation is a woman's drug of choice; you must become her drug dealer.*

She will look for that drug elsewhere if you are not her supplier. Men always say they ***hate the drama***, and older single women try to use ***drama free*** as a selling point in their Tinder profiles. There's a pervasive belief that *mature* women have outgrown their drama needs but look at the audience demographics of shows like *The Bachelor*, and you'll see this is nonsense. Indignation makes women feel alive.

It reminds them that the ***feminine intuition*** their ancestors relied on to sniff out false cues of *Alpha* in Beta men is still working. Even 90-year-old women get off on helping their great-granddaughters figure out if a guy is for real or not.

Game Tip: Don't deny women of this basic need.

The Power of No

The righteousness of purpose is often best displayed when you “*get upset*”; however, it’s not always necessary.

One powerful assertion of *Frame* control is simply the word “No.”

As often as men will blather off a complicit “**yes**” to keep the peace, **women need to be told “no.”** Get into the habit of saying no, even when it seems unreasonable. Get comfortable in saying no for the sake of establishing and reminding her of your authority. Women will gladly remind a man of his responsibilities, but those responsibilities require you to hold the authority to meet them.

She must be reminded of this, but it is also an excellent opportunity to trigger indignation. **Most men don’t see the purpose or value in No.** Experimenting with their respect and Frame control runs counter to their Blue Pill egalitarian training. They just want to keep their heads down, not rock the *pussy boat*, and go along to get along. That’s a recipe for disaster.

Here’s an example of the Power of No.

My wife once asked me if we could buy a new bed for our daughter; I told her no. Money wasn’t the issue; I just didn’t want to build a new bed and get rid of the old one. Her bed was more than acceptable at the time. Mrs. Tomassi just wanted it because of the style and the fear of missing out on a deal (FOMO). She got indignant with me. “I don’t see why we can’t, it’s a good price,...blah blah blah,..” and against my first impulse of agreeing, I again said “**No**. We’re not getting the damn bed.” At that point, the dynamic of the conversation shifted. The conversation wasn’t about a bed; it was now about **Frame**. Average men

will laugh and think, “Yeah, she must’ve held out on you after that!” and for about a week, they’d be right, but I learned a valuable Game Maxim in this:

Game Maxim #30: *No amount of negotiated pussy will ever be worth losing Frame for.*

It’s always better to fuck a woman who accepts you as her authority than some half-assed lay with a woman who’s only fucking you out of a sense of obligation.

As I said, most men come to understand the usefulness of indignation by stumbling into it. This is just what I did. Learning to use indignation is a fantastic primer for ***Frame*** control.

If you fear using indignation or haven’t the patience to *deal with the drama*, rest assured she will find her *drug dealer* in something or someone else.

Please resist the urge to think that her indignation need is some lifetime job you must constantly stoke. It becomes second nature once you learn to identify it and casually provoke it.

CRISIS OF MOTIVE

I had an interesting conversation with a cocktail waitress about why she wore sexy clothes because they reaffirmed **who she was**:

"I do it for me."

"Really? Lingerie, high heels, push-up bra, that's all for you?"

"Of course. I'm my own woman. I do it for me; you shouldn't care what others think."

"So, it's not about the attention and affirmation you get from the men around you?"

"Well, that's nice if it's coming from the right guy, but I don't wear what I do for them."

"So, if I came over to your house at like, four in the afternoon, you'd be wearing all this while doing chores, vacuuming the house? Not wearing sweatpants and a t-shirt?"

"Well... no, but that's not the point; I'm just more comfortable in sweats..."

"I see."

It was far too easy to box her into the corner she was painting herself into. I wasn't too hard on her; this **Crisis of Motive** is also found in men. I can't recall how many times I've heard guys at the gym tell me the same thing as to why they workout:

"I do it for me! Yeah, of course, chicks check me out more now that I've dropped the fat and got yoked, but this is all for me, man, it's all for me."

I'll admit, I was *that* guy at one time. For a guy, it makes sense to cop the story of the ***singularity of purpose*** since it implies he's his 'own man' – not improving himself to become more acceptable to the women he observably and admittedly wants to get with.

This is the **Paradox of Self-Improvement**: Are you improving yourself for *yourself*, or do you want others to respond more positively? Call that *approval-seeking* if you like, but it doesn't have to be one or the other. It can be both.

Human beings evolved as social animals. Despite all the success porn gurus ranting about social indifference, we all innately *care about what other people think of us*. We all compare ourselves to others (not *who we were yesterday*), and this is nothing wrong.

There are certain side benefits to bodybuilding – improved health, attitude, lower stress, a life-preserving function that results from increased muscularity, etc. But the minute we drop “**a better sex life**” into that equation, we suddenly have to qualify it all with the “*I do it for me*” rationale.

It's as if our motivating desire to get laid is somehow less important than all of that. That's the virtue flex. I'll tell you right now (with 30+ years of lifting on my record) while I enjoy a lower life/health insurance premium. I enjoy sex far too much to let myself become a fat ass. I do it for me, *and* I do it because Mrs. Tomassi (and other women) responds positively to it, and I enjoy the results.

This is a fundamental question guys swallowing the Red Pill and adopting a Game-aware life must answer:

Who are you doing it for?

There are a lot of traps in answering this question. They're traps that the average *crabs in the barrel* will use

to pull you back into the barrel. These traps will convince you you're "***being someone you're not***" just to keep you someone predictable. They're traps that will flatter you for your desire to improve yourself, but only as it serves feminine approval. This is a common tar pit for men on the edge of accepting Red Pill truth:

From *Roissy's The Unbearable Triteness of Hating*:

16. Dancing Monkey Hate

Hater: Men who run Game are just doing the bidding of women. Alphas don't entertain women!

If you want success with women, you will have to entertain them... one way or the other. The same is true of women. Once a woman stops entertaining men with her body, her femininity, and her commitment worthiness by getting fat, old, ugly, bitchy, or single mom-y, she stops having success with men. We are all doing the bidding of our biomechanical overlord, and on our knees, to his will, we surrender, by force or by choice. You fool yourself if you believe you have some plenary indulgence from this stark reality.

Or: If you can't beat 'em, join 'em.

Roissy was responding to exactly this *crisis of motive*. You'll hear the *Dancing Monkey* rationale trotted out by *Men Going Their Own Way* all the time. The crux of MGTO W beliefs is rooted in this same motive crisis. Is what you do, who you are, what you believe, a natural, organic result of your decision-making (doing it for you), or is all that you are the result of a drive to appease women?

This is a good question. Understanding your motives for doing something or believing something can be insightful.

However, taken to its extreme, it becomes a rationale for inaction. Women become the only reason for *anything* men could do, believe or be interested in. After a point, it becomes unfalsifiable.

Introspect

The Manosphere has a way of lauding introspective men concerned with their self-improvement. Bravo! Bravo, introspective men! Dig deeper, embrace your inner White Knight. Genuine introspection is only helpful in the light of **why** you're being introspective in the first place.

You may get a pat on the back from womankind for introspectively aligning yourself with women's interests – or you may get a well-needed cold bucket of Red Pill awareness splashed in your face. The question is still who or what are you being introspective for?

With a crisis of motive, it's easy to cast doubt on the reasons of others who disagree with you. However, it also reaffirms our decision-making. Critics of Game like to say, Red Pill guys are only interested in getting laid as much as possible. This is a disqualifier based on the idea that sex is a Red Pill man's only true motivator — not himself, not his education, not of his own genuine choice.

Their only frame of reference is Red Pill guys believe what they do to get laid. Therefore they must necessarily dance to the tune women (or their uncontrollable sexual impulse) are playing for them. The message is guys aren't acting as individual rational agents but as robotic slaves, beholden to outside influences (women or their sex drives). In other words, someone or something is controlling their decisions for them. That makes them *tools*.

That's a powerful affirmation for the one making accusations of disingenuousness. It confirms for himself that not only is he a "genuine" actor, but his insight *must* necessarily be more valid than the guy he's judging. The problem is that the accuser is also molded by outside influence. Thus, his motivation is suspect of a crisis of motive.

I understand this is some heady shit to take in for a book on the **whys** of Game. However, it's an essential consideration for guys on the cusp of Game-awareness, doubting their genuine want for changing themselves. Men need to ask themselves, why am I changing my belief? Why am I shifting my customs, my interpretations? What I'm doing isn't working, but why do I want to change to make things work better? It comes from introspection or a new awareness from an outside influence (the Manosphere).

The answer to “*Who do you do it for?*” is both yourself *and* the outside motivator.

So, what made you change? Was it something I wrote? Was it a traumatic experience that shocked you into awareness? Or were you just getting what you'd always gotten by doing what you'd always done?

Dancing Monkeys

When you alter your perspective on life (specifically women), you become a new person. The question you'll always get from people you know is, *who are you trying to be?* For guys realigning themselves to do better, managing your expectations according to women's nature will always seem a bit galling for needing to do so.

The perception of having to adapt oneself to the *needs* of women to broker some reward is not only senseless, but it pisses off men who spend an excessive amount of effort to better themselves ***for themselves*** and not be appreciated for it.

I'm cursed with a broad spectrum of interests and hobbies. I've been blessed with a lot of natural gifts and talents. I developed the skills to better enjoy them, profit from them, and explore things I find fascinating. But for the greater part, I don't do these things *for* myself.

Instead, I do them because I'm genuinely curious and passionate about them. I didn't get into competitive fencing in college because I thought chicks would dig it. Nor did I pick up the sport as some "*doing it for me*" personal validation - it just looked like a lot of fun. Even when I have my ass handed to me, I still enjoy it.

The outcome of having developed those competitive skills, combined with the physical prowess I developed, provided some side benefits to my enjoying fencing, lifting, martial arts, and all of the other sports I've engaged in over the years. The side benefits are pretty evident in sports, but I have hobbies and artistic pursuits that would probably make me a certified *Nerd*. I use these interests to benefit my personal and professional life, but some of my interests are not the things women look for in a guy.

I don't care, but that doesn't erase the preconceptions women (or anyone really) have of those interests. It's easy to say, "*Well, that's just me, take it or leave it, baby!*" But the fact remains, there will always be things you like that will never be an attraction cue for women. They're likely to be an obstacle to attraction.

The Intelligence Paradox

There's a popular misconception that women find intelligent men more attractive. Attractive for long-term security and dependability as a provider? Yes. Are they arousing as a Hypergamous sexual prospect? No. The Feminine social order likes to promote the "*intelligence is sexy*" meme to have better-prepared providers dutifully waiting for women once they've had the Bad Boys in their "*Hoe Phase*" and are ready to cash out of the SMP.

That's a kind of bitter medicine for men who've invested themselves in intellectual interests they *were*, at one time, genuinely fascinated by. Once the imperative takes what it can benefit most from those interests and labels it "sexy," they cease to be genuine fascinations. The question becomes, "Who are you doing this thing for? To be a better prospect for women, do you *do it for you*?"

Intelligent men eventually realize their interests aren't sexy to women. If anything, those pursuits become an insufferable bore to women. While the *idea* of a hot, intelligent lover is appealing to women's hindbrain, applying that intelligence is another thing entirely.

Hypergamy doesn't care about your grasp of philosophy, your love of mathematics, your Master's degree in political science, or that you can distinguish impressionist painters from cubists. Hypergamy **does** care about your capacity to apply that intelligence in the service of women's security.

Opportunistic Hypergamy enjoys the benefits that men's intelligence creates for women's security, but your intelligence in and of itself is decidedly unsexy. Unfortunately, this realization only comes after intelligent men played along with Gynocentrism and committed themselves to a woman he believed found his *beautiful mind* so attractive.

The desire to find a common interest to hook up with women is an interesting one. The MGTOW crowd will use this to illustrate how men autonomously shape themselves to the ideals of women. In terms of living in a feminine reality, they're right. Whenever men engage in any leisure activity, passion, hobby, etc., that doesn't directly benefit their wife or girlfriend; it's always perceived as a waste of time.

If she cannot realize a tangible benefit for herself – or the potential “family” or the “relationship” – men's effort is pointless and frivolous in contrast to engaging with her, entertaining her, or relating with her interests. This is the innate solipsism of women I've addressed in previous books.

In a Gynocentric society, if something does not directly benefit women, it's not benefiting humanity.

It's easy to apply this dynamic to something that's directly relatable to women's sexual interests. Men ostensibly lift weights for their validation – they *do it for them* – but when it's evident that a man can leverage that motivation and good physique to arouse women, his motives become suspect. When your interests can directly affect women's arousal/attraction, that is when your motives will come under scrutiny.

Saying I enjoy reading books on astrophysics in my leisure time wouldn't draw the same suspicions of my motives as my saying I've been a bodybuilder for most of my life because I just enjoy it and the health benefits. Critics often lament,...

“If I didn't know any better, I'd think the Red Pill is feminism for men! Even though women are shit, you still have to perform under the new plan.”

There is a vast chasm between performing for a woman and performing for yourself. This is the subtle distinction where critics get it drastically wrong. Most Red Pill noobs are still guilty of the former at times, but at least they recognize it and do a better job of putting themselves at the center of the *Frame* rather than a woman's.

Game Maxim #31: *A woman's love, attention, loyalty, empathy, desire, etc., are all byproducts of a man who unapologetically takes care of himself, his needs, his desires first.*

A man must make himself his ***Mental Point of Origin***. He prioritizes himself as the source of his own decision making which women find attractive. *Mental Point of Origin* is not a "Put yourself first!" positivity mantra all *Tony Robbins*. It's fundamental retraining of your thought process that puts *you* as the first thing that occurs to you in any decision.

Making yourself the priority in your thought process improves your life from an overall personal perspective, *and* it has the effect of attracting/arousing women. Does it matter what motivated your change in thinking or behavior?

Men must perform. Even when they're performing from an origin of genuine curiosity and interest, they will impress women. You cannot remove yourself from the Game. You cannot remove yourself from the performance assessment aspect of the Game. There's a misconception that Red Pill advocates believe all men need do is be good-looking, aloof and let women come to them. It's a misbelief that *performance* doesn't matter.

The truth is that even if you're not approaching, not running Game, you're still *performing* in some capacity. You're still presenting a presence that women (and other

men) will evaluate even by not performing. It's only then that you realize the genuineness of your motive.

We are who we say we are

We **can** alter our personalities. Our conditions or choice changes them, but to suggest that personality is static is a falsehood. Genes and biology indeed form our personalities, but they are by no means immutable. The trap is to think that altering your personality is disingenuous. There will always be convincing “actors” or “poseurs” that, when confronted, we sense (or even know) they are pushing a self-belief they’re not entirely comfortable with.

They are incongruent with what they want us to expect of them. There is merit to the “Fake it till you make it” doctrine, so long as you actually “Make it.” We only view people as false, superficial, or as “trying to be something they’re not” when we expect a set of personality behaviors.

This is the root issue of *Incongruence* in Game.

Incongruence is only as valid as it is noticeable. If you met a likable cocky-funny guy at a club this weekend, how do you know whether he’s the real deal or stretching the limits of his personality if you’ve never met him before? You may have preconceptions and expectations about his character by how he presents himself, but his *authenticity* depends entirely on how well he sells his personality to you. Assuming he’s *selling* it to you at all.

No one likes to think they could be duped into believing someone is something they’re not. Our egos are wrapped up in thinking we’re good judges of people’s actions and character, especially women, whose mating strategy is dependent on being a good judge of character.

There are apparent *tells* of Incongruence we instinctively avoid – insane homeless people talking to themselves, for example – but discerning Incongruence is

really about how deeply that person *believes* in his personality shift.

You will be *trying to be something you're not* so long as who you're *not* is an act for you. Average men who come into Red Pill awareness have difficulty letting go of their old, comfortable Blue Pill personalities.

This is how you get Purple Pill poseurs - men who can't deny the uncomfortable truths of the Red Pill but still want to force-fit those truths into who the Blue Pill made them. This creates a glaring Incongruence in Purple Pill men who serve two masters - the Red Pill and the Blue Pill. The half-measures necessary to float both ideals make them inauthentic in their personalities.

Men are innately idealistic. While women are more interested in people, men are more interested in things. We are innate problem solvers. A sense of purpose (not *meaning*) is vital to our personalities and sense of self. Our idealism is both the source of our greatest strength and our Achilles Heel. Men search for purpose. This requires us to imagine what is possible and to be bold enough to effect our will upon the world. For men's part, their outward-looking interests and curiosity make them competent men and make them attractive to women. Their attractiveness is a byproduct of curiosity that is indifferent to the inward self-importance of women.

Game Maxim #32: *Women should only ever be a complement to a man's life, never the focus of it.*

You've likely heard me say this a dozen times on my podcast. Guys love this quote because it sounds like "Go get 'em tiger!" to the *Chase Excellence not Women* crowd, but there's a practical reason for this mindset. Women's

innate solipsism means their focus is primarily on themselves. Once ***your*** primary focus becomes women, they quickly lose interest.

If you treat her like a fan, she'll treat you like a celebrity.

Men's attractiveness lies in the results of that outward-facing fascination with the world and things, which excludes women from men's attention. Focus on the things you ***genuinely*** find interesting. Humans are social animals.

It's impossible not to seek personal validation in what you think doing those things represent to others. So lean into it. Saying you *do things for yourself* only echoes the self-importance of women's solipsism. It alludes to a desire to be perceived as more attractive for having a self-conscious awareness. You're not more *real* because of it.

PART IV

GAME MAINTENANCE

THE TALK

“Where is this going?”

“What am I to you?”

“Are we ‘official’ now?”

“Why don’t you show me off to your friends?”

“Why don’t you want to meet my parents?”

“We need to have a Talk.”

There will always come the point when a woman believes it’s time to force the issue of exclusivity on a man. It’s time to have **The Talk**. In my first book, there is a 6-part series about *Plate Theory*. This *theory* is about men dating non-exclusively – not just for sexual variety but also to understand women’s nature. I’ve also covered what’s known as **The Talk** from more practical considerations. However, feminized pop culture has turned **The Talk** into an expected life event for women.

The Talk is the defining of a relationship. It is an expected *Frame* grab for the entitled women of today. In a feminine-primary social order, that *Frame* is always presumed to reside with a woman according to her “needs.” As average men have become unassuming in masculine authority, a need for a confirmed relationship status often puts them into the feminine role of initiating *The Talk* themselves.

There are few worse indications of a Beta/Blue Pill mental state than men negotiating for exclusivity with a woman. Nothing confirms a lack of options (and value) than

a man who petitions a woman for exclusivity. The Talk should always be initiated by her, not you.

What does “The Talk” mean for a relationship when a woman has resorted to it?

She feels powerless, but it’s also acknowledging opportunity cost versus her sexual marketability.

Game Maxim #33: Women would rather share a successful Alpha with other women than be saddled with a faithful Beta.

However, that *sharing* has a time limit. That period is limited by how long a woman believes she can preserve her peak sexual market value. As outlined in my second book, *Preventive Medicine*, those peak years are generally the ten years between 18 and 28. During this time, a woman must make the best use of this *peak sexual capital* by making smart investments in men who have the potential to go on to be winners – or to lock down confirmed winners in a long-term monogamous commitment.

Most women squander this *capital* with “unplanned” pregnancies, getting fat, and sexual partner counts in the triple digits. Some women invest that capital into a high-value man or a man with high-value potential and hope that their investments (or bets) will pay off over time. Her sexual market value decays over time while his (ideally) increases over time.

The longer he takes in committing, the more her capital depreciates, and the less viable she is in the sexual marketplace. All women know this. It’s why the *Epiphany Phase* (the ages of 29-31) is so stressful for women.

If any of your Plates are in this age range, you can expect The Talk to be forthcoming. Single women in

this demographic will literally write The Talk into their Tinder dating profiles:

"31, Single White Female: Done with the game players! I've had my fun (no fun for you), and I'm ready for something serious. I'm looking for a man who's ready to move forward with me in my Journey of Self-Discovery. No Commitophobes! My son comes first, so swipe left now if that's a problem."

Profiles like this are preemptive versions of *The Talk*. The hubris in today's women is the obliviousness of their entitlement spelled out in their dating profiles and social media. But this is not a dating profile; it's The Talk women hope to get out of the way before they even get into a relationship with the high-value man they're told they deserve. Know this: The Talk is an ultimatum, and ultimatums are always declarations of powerlessness.

But, what does this mean for her perception of the man she's trying to negotiate for?

Are ultimatums declarations of powerlessness? Yes. In The Talk, you have a woman issuing the request, and the sense of powerlessness contrasts. **The very act of having The Talk is a negotiation of Desire.**

The Medium is, again, the Message. The fact that a formal *talk* would be necessary to legitimize a relationship is the message she ignores or hopes you won't recognize – it's a negotiated obligation, *not* a genuine desire. A good relationship is the byproduct of genuine desire on her part. Passion is not, and will never be, a byproduct of a negotiated commitment on *his* part.

Dumbing down this ultimatum by calling it "*The Talk*" and dancing around their long-term security is a **Buffer** for

women. As with all Buffers, the intent is to lessen the impact of rejection by preemptively buffering its seriousness should it come to that. There are a few reasons women will move for something like The Talk. First and foremost is a need for certainty. When a woman presses for exclusivity with a man, she tips her hand in the Hypergamous scheme of things. The message is twofold:

1. She sees you as *high enough* value to seek some exclusive commitment.
2. She acknowledges (or is beginning to) that her capacity to attract other prospective men is depreciating.

Hotter, younger women with greater sexual market options, who know their value, rarely push for this *official* relationship formality (i.e., The Talk). However, there is a reason young women might dish up The Talk. On some level of consciousness, women seek to alleviate the competition anxiety from making an emotional investment in a man who is confirmedly 1-2 steps above her sexual market value. In this instance, a passive form of *Dread* plays a role.

Hypergamy cannot afford to miss out on an *ideal* pairing. Women are socially and biologically incentivized to lock that perfect pairing down ASAP. The more evidence that pairing is tilted in her favor, the greater the urgency to get him to commit. And anything is on the table when it comes to resolving that commitment; “unplanned” pregnancies, appeals to religious convictions, and of course, The Talk.

As women enter the *Epiphany Phase*, the need for The Talk becomes more urgent. Hypergamy cannot afford the opportunity cost of emotional investments that drain her

sexual capital. This is why women tend to opt for stable Betas during the *Epiphany Phase*.

Unattached, high-value men entering their peak SMV phase are less inclined to seek or agree to exclusivity in this demographic when they have more available sexual options. Average men, unused to a sudden interest from women of this age, are usually eager for The Talk irrespective of a woman's sexual history or reasons for wanting exclusivity.

On the woman's part, what is Negotiated Desire indicative of in the relationship?

Have they lost respect for him? It depends on the man and woman involved. The push for exclusivity on her part is prompted by necessity or Hypergamous anxiety.

Genuine desire cannot be negotiated, and it's essential to consider that this is equally true when it's women doing the negotiating.

Blue Pill conditioning has taught women to expect a man to formalize monogamy *with her* is not just her right, but men will understand and accept that it is "***the right thing to do***" if he wants to be called a *real* man. We have an entire world reinforcing this male-shame narrative in society. From church to popular media, you're not a "*Real Man*®" if you so much as question your role in exclusivity based on a women's need of it.

This presents a conflict for women. Women want men who naturally *Just Get It*, but the necessity of asking a man for The Talk in the first place implies he *doesn't get it*. **Just the need to talk about commitment conflicts with her need for his organic understanding of women - an understanding that defines him as "high value."** If he were genuinely high-value, he would ***Just Get It*** that he's supposed to commit to her, right?

Pushy, loud-mouthed, outspoken women raised on the *Fempowerment* narrative are often the most insecure regarding this conflict. On the one hand, the narrative tells her to expect a man to be ***her-equal-who's-better-than-her-equal*** and to “man up” and formalize commitment on his own.

On the other hand, when he doesn't commit, the anxiety that comes with the countdown to **The Wall** pushes her to force his compliance or provide her with long-term security. The only way to get something done right is to do it yourself, right? Wrong. Because doing it yourself negates the *authenticity* of the result. Imagine this scenario with an Empowered Woman® dealing with the average 30-something man who represents her only viable relationship option. She may lose respect for him, but her frustrating situation compels her to force the issue of exclusivity with a guy who *doesn't get it*.

“But Rollo, my base assumption is that all women will push for commitment eventually and want to pressure you into it and ‘make things official.’ What does this mean for the health of any relationship that follows?”

The necessity of The Talk in the first place puts this assessment into doubt. Women who don't push for commitment likely view the nature of that relationship as temporary. There *is* no potential, so there won't be a *Talk*. The problem of making that commitment overtly public has the effect of qualifying what may've been genuine desire without it.

When The Talk enters our popular consciousness, it becomes another “typical male” failing. He doesn't *get* that he's supposed to commit. Men become infantilized for not understanding women's correctness in wanting a formal

declaration of monogamy. Once that childishness becomes a truism for women, what might've been a good pairing of a man and a woman, based on genuine organic desire, turns into an obligation.

It becomes his duty to convince her that he's not a child by living above that truism. The relationship then becomes less about real desire and more about satisfying Girl World's "official" narrative.

So, what should I do if I get The Talk from her?

You tell me. This book isn't about prescription. *What* you do is ultimately up to you, but knowing all this, at least you can make an educated decision. From the outset in the *Plate Theory* series (from my first book), I told you there *would* be plates that fall off. This happens due to her decision, your decision, or the simple logistics of continuing to keep her on your roster.

The adage "*slow to hire, quick to fire*" should be a rule of thumb, but remember, spinning plates (dating non-exclusively) should **never** be about increasing your notch count. Sex is just the proximate goal. The ultimate goal is developing an abundance mindset and confidence through realized options in your dating. Plate Theory is also an insurance against ONEitis and the *Soulmate* myth.

As such, you must accept that there will be women who will *fall off your sticks*. Sometimes they may be the ones you like a lot. Know that when you get The Talk, it's time to make a decision, and that decision is a test of your resolve. The Talk is *always* a test of *Frame*, but moreover, it's a test of your internalizing an abundance mindset. Is committing to this one girl worth the opportunity cost of maintaining your lifestyle?

Why do you *want* to make things official? Letting a plate fall off, or removing her by choice, is a real test of Red Pill

awareness for guys who are likely unfamiliar and very uncomfortable with it. If your first thought is, "*I can't let her go, what if she's the One?*" you haven't let go of your Blue Pill idealism. When you get The Talk, it's time to decide what the Red Pill means to you.

If you plan to have a monogamous long-term relationship in the future, keep these things in mind. It is vital to the health of any relationship that a man establishes his *Frame* as the basis of their living together before any formal commitment is made. If a woman hasn't given you The Talk, she may already presume exclusivity in the relationship as a given.

This is why **polarity, not compatibility, is the basis of a healthy relationship** firmly in your *Frame*. If you are not exclusive with a woman, do not give her the impression that you are, or you will be. Ethically and logistically, it is to both your benefit that you maintain your options.

Too many men get lazy. They think *Frame* is fluid; conditions influence the balance. It passes back and forth between him and her, but this is an egalitarian cope for men whose wives essentially call the tune in their relationships.

The overall *Frame* of your relationship must be led and molded by you.

It is to both your benefit that you do. Even influential, careerist, intellectualizing women still crave a worthy man with an established *Frame* to enter into. Outwardly they bitterly fight it, but ultimately it's what will make for a healthy balance she cannot achieve if she is the one setting the *Frame*.

Today, there is a growing undercurrent of mid-life women questioning and regretting their past decisions to remain single into spinsterhood. Their wait for a *worthy*

man is long since over. For all their rationalizations, the one thing they still refuse to accept is acknowledging that a man's *Frame* that their "fierce independence" wouldn't allow for is precisely the salve their egos desperately need later in life.

Gentlemen, you **will** establish *Frame* in any monogamous relationship you enter. Either you will enter her reality, or she will enter yours.

SHE'S UNHAAAAAAPPY...

Do women seem more or less happy to you?

It's hard to qualify what happiness means to men, but when it comes to women's happiness, most guys expect women's experience of happiness to be similar to their own. From an Evo-psych, Evo-bio perspective, any happiness metric between the sexes should be measured by considering each sex's gendered experience of happiness.

In a Gynocentric world, women's happiness, satisfaction, and *needs* are the litmus test of a man's *Burden of Performance*. You're not a *Real Man* if you aren't making her happy. In Girl World, *Real Men* are responsible for their women's contentment. Unlearn this now.

Happiness becomes a subjective evaluation because men and women rate their experiences differently. What makes for a happy woman is not always what makes for a happy man. It's similar to men and women's differing concepts of love.

Men approach love from an idealistic perspective, women base their emotional investments on opportunistic criteria. We're taught men and women to share a mutual concept of love, respect, happiness, and responsibility from an early age. This *Blank Slate* presumption is where intersexual problems find their root.

Egalitarianism conditions us to believe we both share mutual concepts of what should and should not make either sex happy in the long term. In this case, women are largely misled by the equalist narrative. For over sixty years, women have been conditioned to believe they can meet their own idealistic goal of "*having it all*" by following the '**Strong Independent Woman®**' narrative. Modern women are only now concluding that this pro-woman life plan has been nothing but feel-good advertising.

However, society has standardized the idea that women don't see any alternative. Having invested their most productive years in this narrative, they find themselves unhappy with the results of their lives. **Equalism** would have women believe that what makes men happy **must** necessarily be what makes women happy - or *would* make them happy if only the "patriarchy" allowed women the same opportunities to experience it. If we are all *Blank Slate* equals, what makes women and men happy **must** be mutually shared.

Thus, when Gynocentrism defines the experience of *happiness*, men can only be *happy* by crafting their identities around the female experience. Furthermore, women must become men and craft their personas around masculine ideals that seemingly bring men happiness.

In our westernizing world, the effort to force androgyny on society has had the opposite effect on women's happiness. Modern studies show that women's perceived happiness has been at an all-time low since researchers began collecting data. Women live longer lives, and at no point in history have women enjoyed more access to the means of more success than now. More women are enrolled in college than men, while men fill our prisons at 12 times the rate of women and commit suicide at 3-5 times the rate of women.

Yet, for all of this, women express feeling less satisfied with the quality of their lives. American women are wealthier, healthier, and better educated than at any other time in history. They're more likely to work outside the home and earn salaries comparable to men when they do. They can leave marriages at will and sue *sexist* employers. For over 60 years, women have had unprecedented control over their fertility and sexual selectivity.

On all fronts — graduation rates, life expectancy, and even job security — men are increasingly the second sex. However, for all the achievements of the feminist era,

feminism failed to deliver on the promise of women's happiness. In the 1960s, as Betty Friedan diagnosed her fellow wives and daughters as victims of "the problem with no name," American women reported themselves happier, on average, than did men.

Today, that gender gap has reversed. Male happiness has inched up, and female happiness has dropped. In postfeminist America, men are *happier* than women.

Women's dissatisfaction with their lives always traces back to uncooperative men. It's men's reluctance that's at fault in making feminism the roaring success they just know it could be if men would just accept their diminishing importance and superfluosity.

What today's woman has been sold is the careerism, status-seeking, and ambitiousness that's driven men to their sense of happiness-through-accomplishment (with all the prerequisite sacrifices needed to get there) is necessarily the same path to women's sense of happiness and fulfillment. Remember, we're all just *Blank Slate* equals, right?

But men and women are, in fact, different. As the social experiment of equalism continues to destroy lives by insisting we're functional equivalents, women are coming to find (often too late in life) that happiness comes as a result of satisfying needs that are innate to their nature as a female. Faced with this evidence, equalism and feminism fluidly redefine what "**should be**" happiness for men and women.

Gynocentric society requires men to find fulfillment in making women happy in striving for an "equalist" utopia. But that contentment for women will always be elusive because the very nature of happiness is never a sustainable state for either sex. Regardless, a need to make men the culprits in that unending repression of female happiness comes into play.

Worst Case Scenario

When it comes to security, most women share a common mindset. This is the 'worst case scenario' mindset. **Good Game depends on you understanding this mindset.** We expect it from a mother or matronly relative, maybe even an overprotective sister, but to some degree, all women share an aversion to risk. That may not be in all aspects of a woman's life, but this risk-averseness is rooted in women's innate vulnerability. When women are wary of your approaches, or you give off the "creep vibe," it's precisely this worst-case scenario that computes in a woman's mind.

There are times when this can be overridden, but it's part of a woman's psychological firmware to want to mitigate risk to ensure her own and her offspring's survival. Whether that's a risk of injury, loss of resources, or something that has a potential for providing her with security, the innate female subroutine is to play things safe.

Dad encourages rough and tumble play with his sons - Mom stresses over skinned knees and bruises. **When considering men for a long-term mate, this risk-aversion is projected onto them in protection, provisioning, and parental investment.** It also defines the power dynamic of the relationship when a woman's *Frame* is the predominant one.

In the social media age, women's risk aversion is combined with an evolutionary need for sustainable long-term security. Peruse any Tinder profiles of women in the 29-40 year old demographic. You'll see what I mean. Hypergamy is rooted in doubt. That doubt asks one question: *"Is he really the best I can do?"* That question demands a constant reverifying of security. What results from this need for security is a preoccupation with

imagining and planning for the ***Worst Case Scenario***. *If things go sideways, what am I going to do?*

Every possibility for the worst outcome is contemplated and anticipated by women. Look at the most popular memes reposted by women on social media. These messages have commonalities: encouraging women not to “sweat the small stuff” or empowerment quotes reminding women they’re more competent and secure than they think. All these memes emphasize alleviating women’s instinctive worry about their security.

In our evolutionary past, it served women best to err on the side of preparing for disaster. Very few women are known for their genuine optimism or faith in a better outcome which didn’t come to it with the worst case scenario in mind. Some women are saccharine motivational speakers, women’s ministry leaders, and “make it a great day” believers in the magic powers of positivity. But even when it is genuine, it comes as the result of wanting to mitigate the risks of the worst-case scenario imagined for their lives.

Game Maxim #34: *A man’s best tool in his Game toolbox is a woman’s imagination.*

That works well for Game, but it also comes with the drawback of women’s *imagining* the **worst** possible outcome. Throw women’s innate solipsism into the mix, and it becomes the worst possible thing that could happen **to her**. The concept of *Dread* is helpful due to this dynamic – but contending with a never-ending battery of ‘**what if**’ doubts and reassurances, you can see the downside of women’s imagination.

Imagination is also why women default to blaming men for not providing them with sustainable happiness.

Women's prolonged happiness is measured by how well a man satisfies her innate need for security and excitement. This never-ending quest to assure women of sustainable happiness is what Gynocentric society depends on. Average men stake their *Burden of Performance* on their capacity to make a woman permanently satisfied, contented, and happy. Their self-imagined *manhood* often depends on their woman's state of happiness.

Social Security

Our equalist narrative teaches women to think they can find sustainable security and happiness in some remote part of their psyche. If only they could be **Strong and Independent** enough to access it, *happiness comes from within*. The goal of our female social order has been to facilitate women's optimizing Hypergamy by outlawing men's influence on that process. Every gender-based law that's come along since the Sexual Revolution has been motivated by a deep female need for assured security.

This was security unique to men, but it is no longer required or expected to be found in an "equalist" world. Men are still held responsible for women's unhappiness but are *expected* to be incompetent in providing it.

For all of the efforts to legislate men's direct or indirect financing of this security, despite every social dispensation levied to women to provide it for themselves, **women are still not happy**.

Pook once said, "**The surest way to make a woman miserable is to give her everything she wants.**"

Men are deductive problem solvers. We *want* to make women happy. Women's happiness seems like a worthy problem to be solved if it means genuine desire, getting sex, keeping the peace, sustaining intimacy, security, and altruistically making her happy.

The problem is that nothing a man can do will ever make a woman happy in the long term. This is because the experience of *happiness* is a means to an end, not a static goal state. Happiness is an affective state. Like anxiety and sadness, happiness is an emotion that prompts us to behavior that benefits us in terms of survival or reproduction.

The bigger problem is that for the last four generations, we have convinced women that this *happiness* is a sustainable, permanent state that men are responsible for delivering if they are to be considered *real men*. Men are likewise conditioned to measure their success as a man by how well they meet women's needs.

“Happy wife, happy life” is an ultimatum, not cutesy marriage advice.

Since the Sexual Revolution, men have been conditioned to measure their *Burden of Performance* by how well they provide women with a sustainable state of happiness and contentment – that can never be achieved.

In my first book, I refer to the *Fallacy of Relational Equity* concept. Blue Pill conditioning teaches men that the strength of their relationships depends on how well they perform in meeting women's needs. Men develop this sense of *equity* they build up by doing the right things they believe a Gynocentric society expects of them.

They're *good men* because they do what women think they need from them. However, the endless whack-a-mole performing to make a woman happy is a display women read as coming from a man who *Just Doesn't Get It*. His try-hard satisfying of her happiness flags him as Beta in her mind. The *Frame* defaults to the woman for such men because he *believes* it's the right thing to do.

Game Maxim #35: Alpha men prioritize their own needs and happiness before that of any woman.

Note here that I say, ***before***, and not “***to the exception of***” a woman's happiness. Polarity is the cornerstone of a healthy relationship. That polarity demands an internalization of good Game on your part. Prioritizing your needs should be instinctual – and women instinctively acknowledge this.

The *Frame* and emotional investment naturally flow from her desire to make you happy. Making you happy should be intrinsically rewarding to her. Thus, she is happy in making him happy.

How do you know she is happy in making you happy? She breaks *her* rules to do so. If she is making rules for you, she perceives herself as holding *Frame*, and her happiness comes before yours.

The majority of men (Betas) would like nothing more than to sustain a woman's happiness. They're taught that relationships are always "hard work." But his work will ultimately never be good enough.

Even the most dutiful Beta can't make a woman happy, but their efforts to make her happy become a process of negotiating for a woman's desire. Her happiness becomes his Game. Whether that's earning the "happiness" of his mother, his sister, his female co-worker, his wife, or living up to the expectations of a social order that puts women first, the effect is the same.

We've made women's happiness the test of how successful a man or his relationships are. The common refrain of a woman leaving a man due to her being "unhaaaaaaapy" is a cliché now. But if it's a cliché, it's because this is the go-to reasoning we've heard from pop-psychologists, marriage counselors, and mommy bloggers for the 70%+ of divorces initiated by women.

We are expected to put a premium on women's sustained happiness in a feminine-primary social order.

Women's happiness has become the prime directive and the metric for a relationship's success. Any concern for men's happiness is either a sign of his weakness or problematic misogyny. At best, it's a complaint, and men are never allowed to be whiners.

Women's default setting is unhappiness. However, I'd qualify this by saying it's a predisposition of discontent.

As the *vulnerable sex*, there is no neutral disposition for a woman. Either providing it for themselves or through the commitment of a man, ensuring long-term security is a lifelong quest for women. Even in a state of indifference, women expect men's incompetence. Women expect the *worst-case scenario* – even from a man she loves and trusts, a woman subconsciously plans for his failure.

A lot of this comes from a lifetime of having male role models portrayed as failures, social ignoramuses, or just ridiculous because of their *maleness*. Women get a continuous narrative that only their unique *femaleness* can solve men's problems of maleness. Only women can save men from themselves. That message leads women to view men as little more than children and drags on their life plan down with their investment in men. Women are taught to expect failure, discontentment, and unhappiness from men from a very early age.

The tragedy of this “education” is that it teaches women to empower themselves to find some life satisfaction due to their independence from men. Yet they can't get around the want to find **happiness** with men – happiness based on the myth that it's a goal-state rather than a process.

This teaching seeks to create some equalist semblance of happiness based on what men define for themselves as happiness. As such, both sexes are disappointed in the other. Women can't be happy with what men can't possibly provide.

Women are taught that an enduring security should be possible in an intrinsically dangerous and chaotic world. So they limit men. They mandate laws to mitigate the risks that men, in their idealism, would naturally be drawn to take. They keep the kids safe, tell them to walk on one side of the sidewalk, tell them not to jump on the bed, tell them not to ride a bike without a helmet and knee and arm pads, and prepare for the most damaging possibility imaginable.

And men, who've always been bigger, more dangerous children to them, must comply with this risk aversion by law or by shame.

Women are unhappy because they expect unhappiness.

They've been taught that the security evolution predisposes them to seek in men was a weakness they need to compensate for if they want to survive. They're conditioned to feel shame for that need. There's shame in looking for masculine comfort, even when they know security is never guaranteed, even in the best-case scenario.

They're unhappy because they're taught that men's happiness is **better** than women's happiness. The male path to happiness is the one they ought to follow no matter the sacrifice, no matter the damage to the family. They were taught that feminist pride and equalist hubris were a better substitute for a family - they believed the *Betty Friedan Gloria Steinem* lie that they would just be "happy captives."

BLUE PILL ALPHAS

"My friend told me the other night that seeing multiple women 'isn't worth it.'

I've heard that more than once from more than one of my friends. And how "living with the guilt and shame" and "hating themselves" destroyed their lives....

It's a hard mentality to break when it's been imprinted on you. My father proclaims to be "in favor of the damsels in distress," including his recent, unquestionable defense of my friend's mom, who divorced his dad after 35 years of marriage. He didn't question her motives for a second, and after she spent the evening hanging out with my mom and him and told them the supposed "real" reasons she got a divorce, my dad automatically cut contact with the guy. Again he proclaimed his belief that men should protect all "damsels in distress."

*He's taken shots at me when my girlfriend's been over, siding with her, and telling her things like "Keep him in line" and "Straighten him out, will you?" He calls me an idiot and scolds me if I don't pull her chair out or put her coat on for her when she stands up. All this influenced my self-sabotaging of a great hookup with a hot 23-year-old. **I didn't realize how Beta I was until I got into a relationship.***

*I didn't even know **I had** these programs because I was incel before. I had a couple of same-night lays that never developed into anything. I also didn't know **my dad** had these programs until he started doing shit like scolding me in front of my girlfriend and instructing her to "train me" and things like that.*

I was kind of in shock that my father would think like that. It felt like he was turning on me, which

*pissed me off. Even in a small way, letting his **Blue Pill** conditioning get in the form of his relationship with his son really got to me, and not in a good way. I felt like my dad was supposed to be on my side. To see him treating her better than he treats me, having conversations with her and helping her work out her finances, giving her career advice, and all that while he won't even give me the time of day? Simply, it's eye-opening. **It's tough to be Red Pill when everyone around you, including your own father/family members/friends, is Blue Pill**, especially when they're an active part of your life.*

Game Maxim #36: Alpha is a mindset, not a demographic.

This guy's father's responses are endemic to men who are **Blue Pill Alphas**. These men can be some of the worst **White Knights** you'll ever encounter. Their reactions are behaviorally Alpha, but their reasoning is rooted in their investments in Blue Pill conditioning. It's always an effort to display higher value by identifying with and qualifying for women they believe should have authority above men.

This manifests as an exaggerated form of AMOGing any guy who doesn't reaffirm his Blue Pill ego investment. So you get a guy who bristles at Red Pill awareness. Expressing anything *Red Pill* becomes an opportunity to prove his value as a *White Knight* and resist any truths that would challenge his Blue Pill ego.

I've known several men who anyone would consider Alpha. They default to action, dominance, authority, and control of whatever life puts in front of them. They handle their shit. They own their business ventures; they have all

the ***Dark Triad*** traits you'd expect from guys like this – but put them in a social setting with an attractive girl, and they go as Beta as any Blue Pill guy you'll ever know.

Their Blue Pill conditioning preempts all *Alpha-ness*. They compartmentalize the Alpha aspect of their personality to put their ***Beta-for-women-Alpha-for-men*** element to the forefront. This can be incredibly annoying when a Blue Pill Alpha bases his brand on ***Beta-for-women-Alpha-for-men***. They literally cannot afford to be anything but an *Alpha Simp*.

Dangerous White Knights

I can't imagine I'm the only guy who watched all seasons of **Daredevil** on *Netflix*. In the first season, they go into the origin and character of **Wilson Fisk (Kingpin)**. This is precisely the type of guy I'm talking about here. Wildly Alpha, autistically unstable, but powerful and in control of his empire. Put a woman in his life, and he transitions all of that Alpha energy to essentially worshipping that woman.

This prioritizing of women above his interests **is** the motivation for his empire-building. These are the Alpha White Knights who channel that Alpha energy to making his Blue Pill idealisms a reality for any woman who fits his ideal.

When that Blue Pill ideal reveals itself to be a fantasy – through the woman herself or, God forbid, a Red Pill-aware guy should take this fantasy away from him intentionally or not – you will see him self-destruct—likely taking that woman, that Red Pill guy, or both along with him.

That's one type of Blue Pill Alpha. Another is the alpha guy in one context but Beta in another. These are the guys I describe when I talk about my military friends. They've faced bullets being fired at them by people intent on killing them.

They hold up like nails and get their job done while commanding other men, but put them in a position of dealing with women, and they'll defer to the *Frame* of their girlfriends and wives without a thought. When their wives leave them, these are some of the first men to swallow a bullet by their own hands.

This Alpha has never been awakened to his Blue Pill conditioning. Say even one marginally critical word about women in general, and they're the first in line to kick your ass. But they're also the most likely to self-destruct when

their Blue Pill idealism is challenged or crushed. In the Manosphere, there's a tendency to conflate Alpha with Red Pill and Beta with Blue Pill. Understand, Alpha is a ***mindset*** and not representative of whether that man is, in fact, aware of his conditions and manipulations.

I got chills watching how writers handled the character of **Wilson Fisk**. I have personally counseled Blue Pill, but predominantly Alpha, guys who've stabbed the new boyfriends of their ex-girlfriends because he was the catalyst to the destruction of his Blue Pill ideal - a disruptor to the union with his *soulmate* girlfriend.

Red Pill-aware men need to understand the dangers of being seen as the antithesis of the idealism these men base their personalities on. This may be him despising you for revealing uncomfortable truths with your lifestyle or pinning his idealistic failures on you and wanting to eliminate both you and the fact you represent. Sorry if that's a bit sobering, but it needs to be said.

I consider *Alpha* and *Beta* to be abstract terms. They are placeholders for concepts. It is entirely possible for a predominantly Alpha man to be thoroughly invested in his Blue Pill conditioning. Likewise, Beta men can be some of the reddest Pill-aware guys you'll ever meet. When a Beta man is ego-invested in Blue Pill ideals, he's pitied. A Red Pill-aware Alpha is likely to be celebrated. However, **the Red Pill and Alpha, or the Blue Pill and Beta, are mutually exclusive concepts.**

Is Provisioning Inherently a Characteristic of a Beta Mindset?

Black Pill Doomers and MGTOW critics will have guys believe that any impulse for provisioning for women on the part of men is inherently a Beta trait. The idea is that any

form of monogamy and provisioning for a girlfriend, a wife, and any kids (prospectively) is evidence of a Beta mindset.

The problem with this rests in defining what the act of provisioning means to both an Alpha and Beta mindset. It depends on their approach to their primary sexual strategies, then reconciling it with the eventual necessity of his parental investment in raising children and maintaining a relational *Frame* within monogamy that at least promotes the wellbeing of any child.

While it's true that low-value men necessarily, opt for a sexual strategy of investing in one mate (via provisioning), and higher SMV men can afford a strategy of lower investment while seeking more sexual opportunities, those strategies are not necessarily reflective of each man's mindset. Thus, the Blue Pill Alpha. A subjectively Alpha man can subscribe to a Blue Pill conditioned perspective and vice versa.

So yes, provisioning can be Beta if that provisioning (and what it took to achieve it) results from an effort to secure the sustained sexual interests of a single woman. Consider a high-value man whose provisioning is the byproduct of his Alpha mindset. Is that guy's provisioning inherently a Beta characteristic?

I'm still on the fence about this concept.

Provisioning is certainly a value-added aspect of a man a woman already views as an Alpha sex prospect. It's not necessarily a prerequisite for wanting to fuck him, but it's not a disadvantage if that Alpha guy also has means, affluence, status, looks, etc. Some of the most fantastic sex I've had was when I was an unemployed semi-pro musician in the late 80s with no money but somehow racked up a notch count of over 40 women.

Provisioning is not a prerequisite for any man with Game, but is it inherently Beta?

Possibly. When a guy has the Blue Pill mindset that makes him believe in the *Relational Equity Fallacy*, and he subscribes to the idea that he's inherently lower value than **any** woman, it follows that he can improve his odds with women by being a "good provider." This old books provider-hood is fast becoming an obsolete sexual strategy for Beta men. I don't think that the act of provisioning itself is inherently Beta or Alpha; instead, it's the mindset and status of that guy that makes it so.

What do we call an Alpha with ample means who refuses to adequately provide for his wife and kids? What do we call a Beta who's based his life and marriage on his ability to provide once he's lost a job?

Why do women look down on men who don't offer equal or greater value to their contributions? Why do women feel little or no attraction to a non-provisioning house-husband? If provisioning were a net Beta trait, why is its absence a source of decreased interest for men?

Is provisioning inherently a Beta trait? It's easy to misconstrue it as Beta because provisioning is a high-value attribute expected from Beta men according to their sexual strategy. Provisioning is associated with Betas because it is integral to their sexual strategy. It's entirely possible to be an *Alpha Provider*, but it's not congruent with what we expect from an *Alpha*.

Provisioning isn't integral to an Alpha male sexual strategy; it's ancillary if it's important at all. Provisioning comes after an Alpha sexual strategy; the Beta strategy depends on it.

OVULATION & DREAD

(Krems, Jaimie & Neel, Rebecca & Neuberg, Steven & Puts, David & Kenrick, Douglas. (2016). Journal of personality and social psychology. 110. 10.1037/pspi0000044.)

The findings in this study reinforced Red Pill principles of Evo-psych. However, there are a few new angles to consider. Remember, the concept of female mate-guarding is defined by what researchers describe as “*desirable mates*.”

For women, forming close, cooperative relationships with other women at once poses important opportunities and possible threats-including mate retention.

*To maximize the benefits and minimize the costs of same-sex social relationships, we propose that **women’s mate guarding is functionally flexible. Women are sensitive to both interpersonal and contextual cues indicating whether other women might be likely and effective mate poachers. Here, we assess one such cue: other women’s fertility.***

Because ovulating (i.e., high-fertility) women are both more attractive to men and more attracted to (desirable) men, ovulating women may pose heightened threats to other women’s romantic relationships. Across four experiments, partnered women were exposed to photographs of other women during their ovulatory or non-ovulatory menstrual-cycle phases and consistently reported intentions to socially avoid ovulating (but not non-ovulating) women but only when their own partners were highly desirable.

Exposure to ovulating women also increased women’s sexual desires for their (highly desirable) partners.

These findings suggest that women can be sensitive to subtle cues of other women's fertility and respond (e.g., via social exclusion, enhanced sexual attention to their own mate) in ways that may facilitate their mate retention goals while not thwarting their affiliative goals.

Here we have two Red Pill concepts confirmed:

1. The influence that perceived SMV (sexual market value) plays in women's sense of passive **Dread**.
2. The influence *Ovulatory Shift* exerts in sexual arousal and motives for sex appeal during women's ovulation phase.

These dynamics play out between men and women according to the perceived SMV of a partner versus the self-perception of their own SMV. This comparison determines secure vs. insecure relationship attachment.

My past essays on this were more of an outline of SMV imbalances than the *motivations* for personal attachments. **Understanding biology's influence on women's behavior is the cornerstone to good Game.** This study provides some key insights.

In understanding SMV and Mate Guarding, it's important to remember sexual market value is contextual and often relative to women's most pressing needs. Depending on that balance (or imbalance), one partner is more motivated to mate guard.

This brings us to the **Cardinal Rule of Relationships**. ***In any relationship, the person with the most power is the one who needs the other the least.***

Mate guarding impulse is relative to the comparative value of both individuals. That evaluation is modified by the perceived value of others in their social environment (i.e., potential sexual competitors):

*Thus, it is a significant challenge for women when other women attempt to poach their partners. **For instance, over 50% of women admit to trying to poach another woman's partner. Over 80% of men admit to having been the object of another woman's poaching**—with about half of men admitting to “going along” with the poaching attempt (e.g., Schmitt et al., 2004; Schmitt & Buss, 2001). Women have a good reason, then, to mate guard.*

Men tend to overestimate the sexual interests of women towards them. Reproductively, it serves men better to err on the side of overestimating women's interest in them, but this dynamic also serves a purpose for women; plausible deniability. Popular group-think defines men as egotistical. They think they're “*all that*” and stupidly believe they see sexual cues from women because “that's just how men are.”

This meme is a social failsafe for women. It pre-establishes a condition where a woman can believably deny interest in a man and attribute it to his ego. Thus, should a man not find a woman attractive or opt for another, this serves as a rejection buffer. It also serves as a precondition for her rejection of an unattractive man.

Several *Schmitt & Buss* studies account for this, but there would still need to be a function for women's mate guarding even if they didn't. That function puts the lie to women's social convention, presuming men aren't as discerning of their sexual cues as they'd like to believe.

[...] whereas men have at times physically isolated and sequestered their female partners to restrict other men's access to them (e.g., in harems), women may analogously socially isolate their partners from potential poachers—

keeping them apart to preclude potentially costly competition for their romantic partners.

The usefulness of this strategy depends on women being able to identify those who might be likely and effective mate poachers and then excluding them (but not others) from their social circles.

If a woman indiscriminately distances herself and her partner from potential poachers (i.e., all other women), she is assured of his fidelity but at the cost of eliminating her access to the numerous benefits of female-female friendships.

This study confirms the Red Pill concept that women will covertly exclude themselves and their lover's company from women who:

1. Outclass them in comparative SMV (hotter women than they perceive themselves to be).
2. Are in their proliferative phase of ovulation.

Women are subconsciously (if not consciously) aware of intra-sexual rivals' ovulatory state. This is evidenced by dress, sexual ornamentation, vocal intonation, scent, sexual proceptivity, etc. Women know when other women are horny. They are also aware of devising methods to protect their sexual investments in "high value" men while ensuring future intra-sexual friendships.

That's the overly scientific way of saying women watch out for other women slutting it up to steal their men. However, the cues of concealed ovulation are so subtle that evolution wired a sensitivity into women that goes beyond the apparent slut. That's how important retaining an optimal mating choice is to women. That sensitivity is part of women's psychological firmware. The study continues:

[...]In addition, if a woman were to consistently and indiscriminately exclude other women from her own and, by extension, her partner's social circle, she might gain a reputation for being non-communal and non-nurturing and thus, for being an undesirable friend. This might thwart her ability to form future friendships with other women and lead her partner to perceive her as highly difficult, uncooperative, controlling, and non-trusting.

*Thus, on the one hand, the costs of indiscriminately avoiding other women are high because women reap essential benefits from making new same-sex friends; on the other hand, **women can and do mate poach with frequency, and those women deeply embedded in one's social circle may have increased access, motivation, and ability to poach successfully.***

Let's make this information Game-applicable. The assessment of female mate-guarding indicates it's a metric of women's genuine evaluation of a man's value. **How valuable is his participation and investment in a long-term relationship, or short-term sexual pairing, to her?**

That assessment is determined by a woman's self-perception, the perception of other women in her sphere, and the perception of a man's value to her and other women. Women want a man who other men want to be, and other women want to fuck, but that optimal man comes at a price.

Game Maxim #37: *Women don't want a man to cheat, but they love a man who could cheat.*

This creates a paradox for women: **The things that make a man arousing and attractive are also the things that make her the most insecure. Learning how to leverage this paradox is the Holy Grail of Game.** Too much comforting security and arousal fades. Too much anxious jealousy and attraction wanes.

Average men ***always*** opt for too much security. They believe jealousy in their women should be avoided because they've been conditioned for sexual scarcity. Since sexual opportunities are few and far between for average men, it's only pragmatic to defuse a woman's uncertainty. A reflex to reaffirm trust in a woman by emphatically defusing jealousy is the hallmark of a Beta mindset.

A good Player develops a sensitivity to a woman's mate guarding. Watch for her subtle wanting to spend more time alone with you, her being more sexual at times you may think odd – but also fits jealousy, over-possessiveness, and unwarranted isolation. Women mate guarding you against other women is an excellent way to establish *Frame*. It's also a strong *Indicator of Interest* (IOI).

Women break rules for Alphas and make rules for Betas. Women guard Alphas against mate poaching by increasing sexual interest in him. They'll *break the rules* to ensure emotional and reproductive investment in an Alpha. *"I'm not usually like this, but I am for you"* is a form of mate guarding. ***Only you bring the slut out in me,*** translates into, *other girls won't be like this for you.* Alpha mate guarding is about the *Alpha Fucks* side of Hypergamy. It's the insurance of reproductive benefits reinforced with sexual gratification.

Women are less likely to mate guard Beta men. When they do, it's meant to protect her interests in his resources. Beta mate guarding brings out the dark side of jealousy in women. The jealous instinct doesn't stem from a worry of outside women poaching him. He's not the man other women want to fuck.

It comes from her obsessive need for long-term security that's only threatened by his potential to develop interests in other women. Average men, preoccupied with making a woman happy, are only too eager to accommodate this dynamic. However, Beta mate guarding begins and ends with the resources he's able to ensure her security with.

A woman's preoccupation with guarding you against other women is a prime indicator of your value to her. It stands to reason that only "desirable" men would merit the effort of mate guarding.

This is an essential Red Pill awareness to have. It allows you to determine a woman's unspoken understanding of where she and you stand in relative SMV comparison. That "desirability," that SMV ratio, that Alpha impression that makes you worth mate guarding, is close to what a woman's self-perceived SMV is in respect to your own.

When we interact with women in the long term, it's easy for men to lose sight of this balance. They think that their frumpy wife is the best they can do. There is a psychological game that low-value women will play with men they **know** are of higher value than themselves. They will continually devalue that man to gaslight him into mate guarding himself. It's a very low investment form of mate guarding for a woman.

That devaluation may take the form of browbeating, gaslighting, nagging, or accusing him of being attracted to other women to enlist him in her mate guarding efforts. He's less likely to be poached if he's convinced it's his moral duty to qualify himself to his wife/girlfriend. It's easier and a lower investment of resources if a low SMV woman can convince her higher SMV man to mate guard himself.

You may think women will rationally consider their long-term provisioning is virtually assured in a feminine-primary social order. Alimony, child support, and a pro-female

government will ensure a security baseline. So why bother to mate guard any man?

Answer: Women's psychological firmware evolved to presume a constant state of insecurity.

Logically, rationally, it makes little sense for women to mate guard in a society that more or less ensures the Beta Bucks side of Hypergamy. But ***T-Rex doesn't want to be fed; T-Rex wants to hunt.*** You can't replace 100,000 years of gut instinct in women with platitudes of female empowerment.

Hypergamy wants what Hypergamy wants. Even with the logical consideration that provisioning is assured, women's lizard brain still responds to environmental and behavioral cues that served them well in our ancestral past.

Passive Dread

With all of this to digest, how do you put this knowledge to use?

The obvious answer is developing an awareness of your value and what it's worth to a woman. This is a good starting point from which you can subtly employ passive forms of ***Dread***.

Women will give you grief for acknowledging the idea of Dread. It's "manipulative game-playing" because it uses women's mating strategies against them. However, Dread is beneficial for a man *and* the woman he chooses in the long and short term.

Critics will say this is unethical; it's an unsustainable game of brinksmanship between a couple that destroys trust. They refuse to recognize that ***Dread is already an integral part of every relationship by order of degree.***

The mate guarding instinct in men and women is evidence of this, but only men are shamed for jealousy in a Gynocentric social order. Sexual selection opportunities for women are the priority. Thus, men's mate guarding becomes *masculine insecurity* while women's becomes *prudent*. This alone should prove that *Dread* – the concern of loss of investment, opportunity cost, and the subconscious evaluation of SMV – is integral to us. Dread is part of our operating system as humans.

Game-savvy men develop a sensitivity to the cues of mate guarding. Learn to leverage this innate insecurity to curate genuine desire in a woman, and this will establish a solid *Frame* for any future relationship. Suggesting this seems counterintuitive to men raised on ideals of trust, comfort, and communication with women. Average men

believe calming a woman's fears and providing her with comfort and familiarity will prove his quality to her. **But comfort and familiarity are anti-seductive.**

Comfort has the effect of killing the urgency to fuck you to keep you. Does a woman compete for what she is constantly assured she already has? It's like telling her, "It's okay, baby, you don't need to fuck me to keep me." Repeat this enough times, in different ways, and comfort replaces sexual urgency. Validational sex becomes transactional sex.

The Art of the Neg

“Vagina tingles are born in the defensive crouch.”
– Roissy

The trick to employing passive Dread is making yourself sensitive to situations and opportunities to use it. Then it becomes an art of gently provoking Dread as covertly and indirectly as possible. This requires subtlety and skill that escapes even the best Players.

One of the better ideas the early PUAs had was mastering the art of the “Neg Hit”, or the “*Backhanded Compliment*.”

In principle, the idea is this: A good Player uses a verbal slight to casually knock a woman’s self-image down to a manageable degree to get her to qualify herself to him. You’ve likely encountered some of the lamest versions in a forum/blog post or some Game hustler’s e-book. Bumbling variations of “Nice nails, are they real?” or “Are you putting on weight?” are standard examples for Game-denialist bloggers.

Typed out on a screen, Negs seem like insults only the stupidest of LSE (Low Self-Esteem) women would respond to. Only schmaltzy pickup lines garner more hate than a Neg, but critics never grasp the utility and psychology behind a well-played, conversational, and situationally aware Neg Hit.

A well-delivered Neg has three effects on women:

- 1. It helps establish *Frame* from the outset:**

Modern women are so used to having men simp for them it becomes the pretense of *all* their interrelations with men. Deftly flipping this script

puts women on the back foot, making the Player a man *she* must qualify herself to be. Women enjoy this challenge, not just because it's a rare change of pace, but the challenge itself helps confirm the man is high value enough to risk her offense – something no scarcity-stricken simp would dream of.

2. **Neg Hits prompt FOMO:** As every marketer of the past century knows if you want to sell to women, play to their innate *Fear of Missing Out*. **FOMO is the Achilles Heel of all women.** This dynamic is deeply rooted in the female psyche. FOMO taps into women's most existential imperative – long-term security. As the vulnerable sex, women's regrets tend to focus on missed opportunities for optimizing Hypergamy.
3. **Neg Hits Stimulate Imagination:** A woman's imagination is the best tool in your Game toolbox. Leaving a woman with a lasting emotional impression of you is the prime directive of Game. However, that dynamic association requires her imagination to be put in gear. Imagination is needed to be intrigued by the man she qualifies herself to. Remember, the emotional association you leave a woman with needn't always be positive. A negative association (**Negative Hit**) is often more effective in stimulating imagination in women. Positive associations are usually confirming of a man's quality. Negative associations (the non-creepy kind) leave room for the intrigue in sorting out a man's quality that women enjoy. Humans place more importance on negative associations than positive ones.

Most men don't have the patience to learn this art. A good Neg requires wit, but moreover, it requires situational awareness. The Neg Hit, if artfully applied, is a form of prompting passive Dread in a woman. Passive Dread generally relies on social proof, preselection, and a man's awareness of opportunities to lean into it. Intentionally promoting passive Dread, setting up artificial situations in which it's predictable, runs the risk of the Player revealing the game instead of playing the game.

A poorly telegraphed Neg Hit is the kiss of death in Game. You're doubly fucked. Not only are you an evil Player, but her intuition confirms you're inauthentic *and* trying to convince her you're a good Player.

Above all, good Negs require situational awareness. Average men think Negs are ham-fisted insults PUAs open a girl with. While a qualifying opener can be effective, Negs are best applied in an ongoing conversation. In conversation, good Game prompts imagination that alludes to social proof and preselection.

Negs are *not* insults

Good Negs are conversation devices that prick at a woman's sense of self and leave her pleasantly questioning her value compared to your own. We call Negs backhanded compliments because it's easier to understand scripted Negs, but "qualifying language" is more accurate.

Neg Hits should come in *The Flow* of a conversation, never the focus of that conversation. Negs are part of the Judo that is Game; they should be the parry and riposte of a conversation, never the thrust or attack.

Again, situational awareness is critical. You need to see the opportunities for using passive Dread. Women's mate guarding of men they find "desirable" is a reasonably predictable opportunity.

See those chances for other women's casual flirtations with you, look for those unsolicited opportunities for easy social proof, and don't dissuade your woman's initial mate guarding response. Lean into it. Casually push back on the mate-guarding impulse, don't jump to reassurances of your undying love and interest.

Intentionally flirting with the waitress while with a woman is overt Dread. Unintentionally flirting back with a waitress flirting with you is passive Dread. See that opportunity for what it is – a chance to restate whose *Frame* she's chosen to be a part of. **She wants to merit your value.** Take that effort away from her, and you become valueless to her.

GHOSTING FRIENDS

“People who knew you in your Beta past will never respect you, and you will never respect yourself if you choose to associate with them anymore. I made a pretty difficult decision to ghost many ‘friends’ from my past.

I decided that if people treated me in a way they wouldn’t treat someone of high regard/respect/authority (their boss, their parent, whoever they look up to), I would NEXT them: boy, girl, plate, ‘friend,’ family member, whoever. If a person doesn’t respect you, it could be your fault and it could be their fault – whoever enabled and created the relationship of disrespect is not important.

What’s important is the result; you’re associating with someone who treats you with disrespect or lesser respect than those they respect, and there is no way a man can respect himself if he’s choosing to spend time with people who don’t respect him.

***Note the word choose.** Sometimes you have no choice, but when you have the option to say to yourself, “You know what? Fuck this, I’m bailing” or “No fucking way am I going to see that guy,” you must use it.*

***How can you respect yourself if you choose to associate with someone who doesn’t respect you?** How can you do anything in life worth a shit? Are you going to spend all the time with them ‘proving’ you’re worthy of their respect? Are you going to spite them until they respect you? Who gives a fuck what they think? It is terrible to give a fuck what someone thinks; they’re likely never going to respect you. Once you decide you don’t respect*

somebody, how often do you change your mind? Do you erase your memories?

How can you believe in yourself if you don't respect yourself? How will you follow a plan to get healthy, wealthy, and intelligent if you don't respect yourself?

For that reason, I ghosted many friendly acquaintances I considered friends once I understood where I was in their hierarchy. Some I'd known for ten years and had shared some good and bad memories with.

I do not regret it one bit.

People who don't respect you won't change how they perceive you once you better yourself; they'll see the old you and a new imposter.

I believe that first impressions last forever and that if you have made an impression on some people that you are a beta, they will never forget where they've pigeonholed you. They will never treat you as alpha and defer to you; how could they? They don't respect you; they 'know' that you're just 'acting differently.'

Compare that with new people. New people see what's in front of them, and they take it at face value that you're a lean, mean fucking machine that appears to have his shit in order and probably always has. Don't tell them about your past when you didn't; they don't need the dream ruined. And if other people talk about your old ways, just agree and amplify and laugh about it – the new person wasn't there, and it's just the other person's word against yours – and you're a likable alpha, so they'll think fuck it and believe you're an alpha and always were.

Lesson: You should consider making some hard decisions about ghosting some people in your life who have disrespected you and boxed

you into a 'Beta' category in their memory. You could turn into Connor McGregor, and they'd only tell people about how you were the Nerd in high school. New people will take your greatness at face value, and when they hear reports that you've upgraded and shit test you, defuse the shit test with great laughter."

When it comes to respecting, the message is simple - zero tolerance. The need for **Ghosting** is a pragmatic response guy will come to when they shift into Red Pill awareness. They know that certain friends, particularly close friends, whose lives are invested in delusions of Blue Pill contentedness, will neither accept this new awareness nor the genuineness of their change in perspective.

Law 10 Infection: Avoid the Unhappy and Unlucky

You can die from someone else's misery - emotional states are as infectious as disease. You may feel you are helping the drowning man, but you only precipitate your own disaster. The unfortunate sometimes draw misfortune on themselves; they will also draw it on you. Associate with the happy and fortunate instead.

- 48 Laws of Power, Robert Greene

Consider Zig Ziglar style optimistic "mindset" peddlers that abound on YouTube. One tenet of that build-a-positive-fantasy-life mental model is the notion you should surround yourself with winners and blow off the losers in your life.

You are the sum of the five people you spend the most time with. This is bullshit, but it's a simple aphorism that rolls off the tongue easily.

Associate with winners, and that winning will rub off on you. They don't tell you ***how*** to cut out the unhappy and unlucky people in your life – especially when they also happen to be your oldest friends or closest family members. This is one of those painful truths that will set you free but still stings like a bitch.

But eliminate them, or marginalize them, you must. Most guys know this or come to know it as the first thing once they unplug. **There's often a high cost to Red Pill awareness.**

The Price of Truth

I rarely make an active effort to help **unplug** men these days. I get that my books, blog, and YouTube channels are an effort, but I mean in the sense of reaching out personally to a guy who I think may be ready to consider Red Pill truths about men and women.

When I do, I'm reminded of the part in the Matrix where Morpheus explains to Neo that he'd broken protocol to unplug him. The rule is never to free a mind once it reaches a certain age. The mind has difficulties letting go of "truths" it's become dependent upon to survive.

That's an accurate analogy for dealing with *unplugging* men in a Game/Red Pill sense. Revealing harsh truths of intersexual dynamics to people too invested in Blue Pill ideals destroys their self-sustaining beliefs about how men and women *should* be.

I once attempted to unplug a local celebrity who, at 48-years-old, just had a painful split with his 30-year-old girlfriend. He'd been married once before and was divorced for all the Beta pandering you might expect. Now he was "blindsided" by a girlfriend well above his own SMV.

Even a basic understanding of the intersexual dynamics would've spared him a repeat of his Beta behavior and her dumping him. But there he was, again, in the same familiar depression, due to the same behaviors stemming from the same misinformed Blue Pill mindset.

I made an effort. I liked the guy. In most other aspects of life, he was pragmatic, driven, focused, and *Alpha*. He had social proof, farm-league celebrity, was affluent and, while somewhat arrogant at times, he was very likable.

However, he suffered from one fatal flaw – he was ego invested in Blue Pill ideals of what women should be, and

so thoroughly that only a man who's lived it his entire 48-years can understand it.

I made an effort to get him to read my first book. He'd have none of it. The reflexive response to what the women in his life had taught him was the misogyny short-circuit for him. I was never really hopeful, but I made an effort from that base need to help another man avoid a painful fate. I had to *Ghost* him.

Not because I'm an asshole or I'd given up, but because it's not pragmatic to apply that effort when others would benefit more from it. He's passed that age at which *Morpheus* says the mind should never be freed, and I've got to be okay with that. That's just the price of knowledge.

When you become Red Pill aware and Game savvy, there will be an overwhelming impulse to *evangelize* your new knowledge with your best friends. And why not? Why wouldn't you want to help your friends and family better understand men's and women's natures?

Understand this: unplugging men from the *Matrix* of their old order beliefs in mythologies about men and women is dirty work. It's best to expect to be hated for just asking the wrong questions about those myths.

If you're familiar with *Plato's Allegory of the Cave*, you'll know the man who brought the truth of the surface world back to those in the cave was killed for his efforts. Most guys aren't ready to have their myths dispelled for them. The best you can do is wait for your moments, ask leading questions and engage them in conversation. The only other recourse is to *Ghost* them.

DEEP CONVERSION

Years ago, *Nick Krauser* dropped a post on his blog called ***Deep Conversion***. I made a mental note in my head about this concept back then because, despite its brevity, *Nick* was on to something significant.

In my first book, I had readers conflating my assertions about women's opportunistic concept of love with "Women are incapable of love - *at all*." Over the years, I've put effort into parsing out gendered concepts of love, respect, responsibility, and others.

Of all these, defining my position on the differing conceptions of love remains the most contentious. I won't reheat this here, however, to restate the premise from my first book:

Iron Rule of Tomassi #6

*Women are utterly incapable of loving a man **in the way a man expects to be loved**.*

In its simplicity, this speaks volumes about the condition of Men. It accurately expresses a pervasive nihilism that Men must either confront and accept or be driven insane in denial for the rest of their lives when they fail to come to terms with the disillusionment.

Women are incapable of loving men in a way that a man idealizes is possible, in a way he thinks she should be capable of.

*In the same respect that **women cannot appreciate the sacrifices men are expected to make** to facilitate their imperatives, women can't actualize how a man would have himself loved by her. It is not the natural state of women, and the moment he attempts to explain his ideal love, that's the point at which his idealization becomes her obligation. Our*

girlfriends, wives, daughters, and mothers are all incapable of this idealized love. As nice as it would be to relax, trust and be vulnerable, upfront, rational, and open, the great abyss is still the lack of an ability for women to love men as men would like them to.

That bolded part is emphasized for an important reason. You must avoid the misperception that women are *entirely* incapable of love. You must make a distinction about men's Blue Pill hope that a woman *could* love him according to his ***idealistic*** concept of love.

When I wrote this, I expected to get this misperception. Despondent men want to believe that Hypergamy prevents women from *ever* feeling a "genuine" love or a *genuine* desire for them beyond what their most immediate need may be. The newly unplugged guys usually accuse me of not thinking it all the way through, or they think I've never considered ***Briffault's Law***:

"The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place."

It's also important to contrast this with the contemporary definition of monogamy in evolutionary psychology:

Monogamy can occur either because a female chooses to remain faithful to one male, or as a consequence of a particular lifestyle.

- Promiscuity, Tim Birkhead

Concepts & Expectations

“Deep Conversion” is what a woman goes through and what she feels for a man she genuinely falls in love with. This man decisively resolves a woman’s Hypergamous doubt – *“Is he the best I can do?”* On an intuitive and cognitive level, this is the man who soundly answers that question, **yes**. When this confirmation is overwhelming, that woman becomes what we call the **“Ride or Die!”** girl.”

Nick refers to this process as a kind of **“soul surrender”** in which a woman recognizes a man’s inherent value to her short-term sexual and long-term security needs. This man is her Hypergamous ideal. His sexual market value in relation to her own puts all but the most deeply rooted doubts of his quality to rest and opens her to associate him with a profoundly emotional state. **Deep Conversion is where Alpha Widows are made.**

This emotional state needn’t always be a positive association, just that the association he represents is an ideal her hindbrain interprets as Hypergamously optimal. If that dynamic seems like a recipe for potential abuse, you’re not mistaken. This *conversion* comes from a woman’s perception of her Hypergamous need, her sexual market value, and what she believes is that man’s value relative to hers.

Shaking a woman out of her devotion to an abusive husband/boyfriend is shaking her from the perception that he represents her Hypergamous ideal. This state is qualified by her self-perception of her sexual market value. Again, this is prioritized by her most pressing needs for her age. Given these variables, a man’s perceived value to her Hypergamy is *always* valued as higher than her own. Hypergamy never seeks its level but always looks for a better-than-deserved SMV comparison.

Average men cannot inspire this kind of total **soul surrender** and devotion in a woman. Most women never get to feel it. Instead, they get off on a vicarious *Deep Conversion* through books like *50 Shades of Grey*. It's the difference between spinning plates with fuck buddies and having a genuine harem where all your girls are exclusive to you. Women aren't aligning with you out of cold calculation or temporary strung-out groupie lust - the connection runs deeper and feels wholesome to both of you.

In Game terms, it's essential to consider *why* most men are incapable of instilling a *Deep Conversion* state in women. First, average men presume that any woman who would find them suitable for a monogamous commitment *must* already feel this sense of *Deep Conversion*.

Otherwise, they'd never agree to that commitment. This is part of men's Blue Pill conditioning; any girl who says "yes" to him **must** necessarily see him as her ideal. Average men don't know that women regularly make long-term relationship decisions based on security needs, not because that guy represents her Hypergamous ideal.

Women would rather cry over an asshole than be saddled with a guy who bores them to tears.

Women readily get into long-term relationships where the Beta they pair with is no comparison to the Alpha she's widowed from - the guy she had a *Deep Conversion* with. This is when women manufacture their indignation and the excitement they lack in cheap (but safe) imitations.

Another reason average men never *convert* is that they never permit themselves to use the dominance women need to feel this conversion. Average men are taught default deference to women.

Their default is one of passive sensitivity to a woman's *needs*. Also, consider women's evolved need to test men and their socialized, overinflated sense of self (ego) predispose women to resist this *Deep Conversion* for a man. Average men can spend a lifetime with a woman who will never feel this conversion.

Deep Conversion

Done correctly, *Deep Conversion* is the most satisfying experience between a man and a woman. So long as you keep the elements in place, it has no natural time limit. It's not hard to do if you have the following core competencies in place:

- **Unshakeable *Frame*.** You know your value relative to hers, and your masculinity is qualifiedly greater than the chumps she's known. You hold sway over a world into which she is willing and eager to participate. Your *Frame* associatively reinforces her ego. She's the kind of girl who can get a guy like you.
- **Playful Misogyny.** You love women but don't take them *seriously*. This is more than just *Amused Mastery*. You understand that women's *needs* are all about being led by a worthy man to guide them. When well-led, women are a delight but a nightmare when left without a pack leader. It's empathetic but not weak. It's complementary but never equalist.
- **Direction.** Your life must have a predominant purpose. Whether it's your music, philosophy, career, fitness, etc., all the arrows in your life point in the same direction — towards building the conventional model of a fully developed man. Every girl will resist conversion if you are only one-dimensional, without purpose, or in conflicted purpose.

*Despite whatever protestations to the contrary, women do not want to be “**The One**” or the center of*

a man's existence. They want to subordinate themselves to a worthy man's life purpose, help him achieve that purpose with their feminine support, and follow the path he lays out.

- Roissy

Sexual Mastery

Women crave dominance above all else in the bedroom. Give her the sex that satisfies her Id, Ego, and Superego. This isn't a one-off, non-exclusive sport fucking. A sexual master inspires a girl so psychologically that even a half-assed knee-trembler in a public toilet has her dreaming about it for weeks afterward. The girl sexually fantasizes about *her pleasing him*, **not** him pleasing her.

These four elements mature with age if you live accordingly. Be aware that *Deep Conversion* has its ego traps and risks, but it is possible. This is the state I referred to as the *transitioning phase* of the *Plate Theory* chapters in ***The Rational Male***.

Despite what ignorant critics say, ***Plate Theory*** isn't about endlessly recycling sexual conquests and measuring one's self-worth by notch counts. The proximate cause is enjoying sex with many beautiful women. The ultimate purpose is experiencing women's nature well enough to know which woman is worth *Deep Conversion* and building something significant with her.

I have critics tell me I'm in error because women's opportunistic concept of love doesn't meet *their* criteria for what love *ought* to be between a man and a woman. This mutually shared, unconsciously agreed-upon concept aligns with men's idealistic (love for love's sake) concept. Still, they don't disagree with women's idea of love being rooted in opportunism.

This is where the conflict starts. If a male-idealistic concept of love is the only *correct* one, and women cannot understand, appreciate or engage in that concept in a genuine, organic fashion, then women entirely lack the capacity for *love* as men would define it.

This is the deductive logic that tears men up when I explain men and women's differing concepts of love. Their definition **must** be the *correct* one. If it is the only valid concept of love, then **women cannot love men**. This is as misguided as women expecting men to understand their opportunism is the *only* concept of love. For guys reeling from the hopelessness that their Blue Pill world was always an exploitative fantasy, it's hard for them to accept that their concept of love is only subjectively *correct* for them.

Blue Pill Idealism

This hopelessness stems from the all-is-equal mentality that the Blue Pill sells us when we are raised by the “*Village*” of pop culture. Equalism is the religion of the Feminine Imperative. Average men are conditioned to believe that men and women, being co-equal, co-rational agents, would necessarily share a common concept of love.

As with everything egalitarian, that equalism outright denies any innate differences physically or psychologically that would separate men and women — or make them adversarial in sexual strategy or purpose in life. This premise is manipulated by the Feminine Imperative to make female mating strategies and women’s concept of love the **correct** expressions of “equalism.”

But therein lies men’s conflict. The influences that teach men their concept of love is mutually shared by women are also the influences telling men that satisfying women should be their life’s priority to achieve it.

Take this path to idealized love away from men, and you get discouraged guys who don’t believe women can feel *genuine* love for them. It becomes a game of jumping through hoops to create a feeling of love in women whose criteria for love originates in their opportunistic concept.

Female critics of differing love concepts personalize every experience they have, their friends have, or their family ever had by referring to examples of their selfless acts of devotion to a confident man. It’s always a story about how they gave everything to a man they felt some undying *idealistic* love for, and how dare I impugn their sincerity in it?

The only way these women came to this romantic love was through a *Deep Conversion* they had with a man who satisfied their Hypergamous opportunism long before they

were ever inspired to those selfless acts of devotion and sacrifice. For every Alpha Widow who ever gave herself over to that conversion and surrendered her soul to a guy who never reciprocated it, thousands more average men will never inspire that degree of devotion in wives who settled on marrying them. Statistically, 80% of men (Betas) will never inspire the *Deep Conversion* that 10-20% of men inspired in women.

The Red Pill Conversion

“Men and women can and do love each other intensely and genuinely. They can, and do, see past each other’s deficiencies, and their love endures.”

For men who innately cling to a romantic concept of love, their kind of *Deep Conversion* can come in the form of **ONEitis**. This can develop into some very unhealthy dependencies. One of the reasons ONEitis is so common among men is because their Blue Pill conditioning predisposes them to put women’s needs above their own. They see the *Soulmate Myth* as a path to sustaining this True Love state – a state defined by their idealism.

For women, this *Deep Conversion* can only result from a man who *thoroughly* satisfies her Hypergamous nature and is willing to **abandon her sexual strategy**.

Like the guy with ONEitis, she dedicates herself to the one guy she was able to lock down who was a better-than-deserved Hypergamous prospect. Women get very upset when this dedication is questioned (not unlike the ONEitis guy) because they abandoned furthering their sexual strategy by investing their egos into a guy who satisfied their Hypergamous natures. To doubt that devotion is to question the wisdom of her investment.

Game Maxim #38: *Alpha Widows are born from Deep Conversion.*

For all of that inherent risk, and despite men and women’s differing concepts of love, men and women can come together in **individual** states of love that are “genuine” to them. Some of them last a lifetime. However,

this state cannot exist without a woman's *Deep Conversion* occurring after a process of testing and evaluating the quality of the man she feels it for.

A man who commits himself to this woman must also feel some sense of his idealistic concept of love being validated by that woman who has devoted herself to him.

Under the old social contracts, under the old set of books, this conversion in men and women was likely something much easier than it is today. The necessities of past eras made it so. Today, women are distracted by social and cultural influences that distort their value to men.

At the same time, those influences place the value of average men so far below average women that this conversion and devotion will always seem demeaning to women – even for men who exceed women's value.

This *Deep Conversion* state is not impossible for you, but it is only sustainable in a Red Pill-aware paradigm. Red Pill awareness and internalized Game savvy is the **only** way to sustain a healthy relationship in an era of Open Hypergamy. Understanding this conversion and how to inspire it is something you should contemplate deeply.

So much of a woman's ego becomes invested in her devotion to you once that transformation occurs. You should also understand that this conversion is always relative to your ability to perpetuate it. And this demands that you internalize Red Pill-awareness and Game savvy into your personality.

PART V

GAME, WOMEN, AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS

ALPHA WIDOWS

Contemporary critics of the Red Pill tend to struggle with concepts that have been debated for decades now. This is nothing new. If you look at any of the exchanges I've had with haters from the *golden years* of my blog, you'll recognize a pattern; distort the basis of concepts that conflict with a person's ego-investments, *straw man* them, then offer some redefinition of what they "really" mean to fit those investments.

One of these maligned concepts is the **Alpha Widow**. I've **written extensively on this idea** for well over a decade. I coined the term in my days as a moderator on the SoSuave forums. Back then, **Alpha Widow** described women's tendency to become fixated on an Alpha lover she fell for in her **Party Years** (the *Hoe Phase*) and still pined for him after marriage.

We didn't just pull the idea out of our asses back then. We came to it due to the overwhelming number of married or LTR men who reported their wives or girlfriends just couldn't get over an old lover they thought was "**the one that got away.**"

At the time, it was just a helpful reference. However, it quickly became a predictable, confirmable phenomenon that deserved more investigation. I first mentioned *Alpha Widows* in **The Slut Paradox** from my first book. It was around this time that Roissy (later *Heartiste*) proposed this simple maxim:

Game Maxim #39: Five minutes of Alpha trumps five years of Beta.

I detailed this in my essay **Five Minutes of Alpha**. Using a **Red Pill Lens**, I saw this Alpha Widow narrative

play out in popular culture. *Katy Perry* had a song out then called *The One That Got Away*, which accurately described everything that goes into making an Alpha Widow.

The movie, *Titanic*, is one big Alpha Widow fantasy. Five minutes of *Jack* trumped a lifetime of support and security with a *Beta* provider for *Rose*.

What is an Alpha Widow?

To understand the Alpha Widow, we must look at women's evolved mating strategy. **Hypergammy**: The primary sexual strategy for women is an innate desire to balance the best sexual/reproductive benefits with the best provisioning/parental investment benefits of a man.

In the Manosphere, this is known as *Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks*, or, more politely, Alpha Seed/Beta Need.

As such, women's mating strategy centers on short and long term ideals in men. The imperative for mate quality extends to both sides of the Hypergamous equation. I'll detail Hypergammy in the following chapters; however, it's in women's evolutionary best interests to get the most impactful sexual experience (good genes) *and* the best long-term security potential (survival benefits). Ideally, this balance would be found in one man, but overwhelmingly history has shown that women must find this balance in multiple men.

Game Maxim #40: *Only women are Hypergamous.*

Hypergammy never seeks its own level — it always seeks a *better-than-merited* exchange from men in their sexual market value than a woman's. When a woman fails to consolidate on a confirmed, high sexual market value male, that man becomes the new standard for what she believes she can attract as a future potential mate.

"I've had a super-hot '8' guy before, so in the future, no man below an eight will ever be my optimal choice."

Even if a woman's perception of her own SMV isn't realistic, her *Id* wants what her *Ego* believes it can get.

The Alpha Widow dynamic is no longer a secret among women. Setting a mating strategy metric for men used to be a subconscious process for women, but in the age of social media, high-ego women *know* if a man does (or doesn't) meet the SMV benchmark of a previous lover.

As women have become more comfortable openly embracing Hypergamy and free of *judgementalism*, they will gleefully compare past boyfriends on social media. Women lament the lack of "*eligible*" men in their lives when their peak value years are behind them. Please note *eligible* implies an entitlement to a man who would be an ideal.

This qualification is a constant process running in the background for women. It is also a complement to men's ***Burden of Performance***. Women's Hypergamous filtering process evolved from an ***Existential Fear***. That fear is having sexual selection removed from her control and being forced, coerced, or tricked into pairing with any man beneath her own (self-perceived) sexual market value.

In evolutionary terms, this meant risking her life on a bad reproductive bet or forcing it upon her. The worst existential prospect for a woman is to have her mating strategy overruled, deceived, and controlled by that of an unworthy man.

However, when women are in a state of control, evolutionarily speaking, a woman's subconscious knows she cannot afford to miss out on an opportunity to pair with a high-value man.

If a woman's *Existential Fear* is to be forced to reproduce with a lesser man, the inverse of this is the fear of losing a high-value man to a rival woman or missing out on the opportunity to lock him down.

This is why women break rules for Alphas and make rules for Betas.

A man who exceeds a woman's SMV creates a benchmark for her '*personal best*' ideal male - to breed with and parentally invest in. He makes a significant impact on her psyche, sometimes in the long term. When a woman *has* had this man but cannot lockdown, he represents a critical, existential loss of an ideal Hypergamous/Reproductive/Life strategy option.

Emotionally, the experience with this man is what a woman will strive (in some way) to recreate with subsequent men in her life. It's a long-term desire to return to an idealized state. This is where the *pinning* for a past lover obsession begins in women.

This is the basis of the **Alpha Widow: *A mental fixation on the man who made the most significant socio-sexual impact upon a woman as her Hypergamous Ideal.***

He is the man, or the fantasy man, who solidly answers Hypergamous doubt: "***Was he the best I can do?***" For a 99-year-old Rose in *Titanic*, Jack at the bottom of an icy ocean answered that question with a resounding, ***Yes!***

FOMO and The Fantasy Ideal

Usually, this male ideal is an actual man from a woman's past. But not always. Sometimes a fantasy of that ideal man, or a brief, seemingly insignificant encounter with an idealized man, might be significant enough to *imprint* his perception on her psyche.

Five Minutes of Alpha Trumps Five Years of Beta.

Sometimes the slightest brush with an "alpha" male is enough to trigger the "what if he was the *One*?" possibilities. It might be one-night sex – with the hot guy in the foam cannon party on spring break in her *wild* college years – or just a missed opportunity to develop a hoped-for connection at a social gathering.

Craig's List's "***Missed Connections***" forum is filled with these regrets. All that matters is the guy, knowingly or not, instilled a sense of urgency that she just ***knew*** represented a prospect of that ideal.

An Alpha Widow can be "*widowed*" from the fantasy of her ideal mate. This fantasy is common among women who marry early in their *Party Years* (the ***Hoe Phase***). They feel they ***missed out*** on an excellent Hypergamous choice (or had it made for them by circumstance or social pressures).

Missing that opportunity leads some women to be widowed from a fantasy of an Alpha who would have been a better choice. An unrealized ideal Alpha is what she pines for, and in the social media age, that pining can turn into a highly marketable form of regret or resentment.

An interest in romance literature is usually exaggerated in this type of widow. Through these formulaic stories of fulfilling an unrealized Hypergamous ideal, women can live vicariously. This widow is the primary audience for divorce

porn fantasy stories when married. *Eat, Pray, Love*, *How Stella got her Groove Back*, and even *50 Shades of Grey* are examples of divorce porn.

The better, more exciting man than the guy she married at 31 is waiting for her. All she needs to do is divorce her boring husband and fly to Jamaica to meet him.

Divorce porn fantasy always keys on an innate aspect of female psychology — **The Fear of Missing Out** (FOMO).

The psychology of FOMO is an inherent extension of women's mating strategy. That strategy of evaluating a man's value is fraught with uncertainties. The anxiety of the Hypergamous doubt – *Is he the best I can do?* – is only compounded by the fact that women's sexual agency has a time limit.

At best, women have ten years of peak sexual agency (18-28) to develop a sense of how to read a man's quality **and then** get him to commit to the long-term security she'll need for the rest of her life. The fear of missing out on a high-value man creates a protracted sense of urgency in women.

The best (and most unethical) Players learn early on how to leverage this doubt and urgency. FOMO is also the primary dynamic advertisers play when marketing to women. Get it now before it's gone! Women are the *vulnerable sex*. FOMO is rooted in women's need for certain security in a world where men can no longer be trusted to provide it to them.

Whether an Alpha Widow is *widowed* from an actual guy or a fantasy, women's mating strategy always moves them towards a "better-than-merited" value exchange and a psychological fixation on the man or the type of man who best embodies it.

A woman's *Id* is imprinted with the model of the optimal Hypergamous pairing (a life or death proposition) and believes that only in achieving it or recreating will that man save or redeem her life.

Social Enabling of the Alpha Ideal

In the 21st century, it has never been easier for a woman to explore her reproductive options. There is a limitless pool of potential Alphas to be *widowed* by. Since the Sexual Revolution, western cultures have done more to facilitate women's mating strategies than any other time in history. In terms of "*sexual liberation*," the goal has always been to ensure provisioning and support – the *Beta Bucks* side of Hypergamy – to give women the impression that they have an indefinite window of time to find their optimal Alpha man.

Just as advertisers play to FOMO in women, they also play to the fantasy that a woman's sexual agency (the power of her sex and beauty) is eternal and evergreen. We see this reflected in the age of first marriages getting older and older.

In the age of social media, women take for granted that they can remain sexually viable, if not indefinitely, then at least as long as a man would. This fantasy only exacerbates the Alpha Widow effect.

Women will fixate on the "*one that got away*," but today, we have social conventions to pander to predictable insecurity in women. In response, numerous industries now thrive on precisely this.

Ladies, will you ever find your soulmate? Our Life-Coaching, our 12 step plan, positivity training, magic personality test, and voodoo priestess will help you find him today.

The concept of a **soulmate** began with women pining for their bygone ideal man. That "**One**" is easier to justify cheating with or agonizing over. If you mix in the

metaphysical, even God is okay with infidelity if it leads to the true *Love* of the *One* preordained for her.

Popular culture tells women they are entitled to that ideal soulmate, and the only way they can remain true to themselves, the only way to live their best lives is to pursue the 'One that got away.'

Misconceptions

The following are some common misconceptions critics have of the “Alpha Widow.” These are mainly attempting to straw-man the phenomenon with no genuine interest in how anyone came to understand the dynamic.

“Alpha Widows result from players who damaged these poor impressionable women.”

Traditional Conservatives (TradCons) use this rationale to build a *heroic* narrative around women. Not all women are victims of the Alpha they were widowed by. The first presumption is that no woman would willingly volunteer for her own widowing. The second is that a Player’s motive was to, intentionally or not, imprint himself upon her, thus damaging her for any future mate. The truth is this: Any seduction requires a willing participant (*Art of Seduction, Greene*), and per women’s mating strategy, women will eagerly participate in their seduction.

These are Alpha Widows, not rape survivors. They participated in, enjoyed, and facilitated their own *widowing* – so much so that they still pine for their ‘*dead*’ Alpha long after marriage.

It’s easy for average men to be drawn into the narrative of a *widowed* woman being traumatized by her former lover. The truth is that the more positive the experience was for her, the more impactful the widowing is likely to be.

If women didn’t think fondly of the “one that got away,” she wouldn’t be an Alpha Widow in the first place. The emotional despair women feel over that Alpha usually results from having missed pairing with him and settling for a *lesser* man by necessity. This is a dull pain for women throughout their lives.

In settling on that *lesser* man, she is circumstantially *forced* into her **Existential Fear** – reproducing with a man, *not* of her choosing.

This is a straightforward narrative for average men to follow. Women will often refer to their ‘asshole ex-boyfriend(s)’ as the man (men) responsible for her being **damaged**. Women in their **Epiphany Phase** usually incorporate some narrative of having been used by the Bad Boy Jerk who came before them.

This *damaged* narrative locks in with a woman wanting to “**do things the right way this time.**” My friend *Dalrock* used to refer to this as women wanting to “**Stick the Landing**” after the gymnastics of their *Party Years*.

Women use the narrative of *Damaged Goods* as a failsafe to excuse their sexual hesitancy with the Betas they settle on. Thus, you get the typical Nice Guy who’s apt to blame his wife’s frigidity on the asshole Player who damaged her before he came along to save her.

A self-righteous average man loves this *damaged by the Player* narrative. It affords him endless opportunities to prove to **his** woman how positively different he is compared to the asshole Alpha. She still imagines she’s fucking while they have sex.

“Alpha Widows are just men thinking the worst of women because they’re bitter and burned.”

Yes, despondent **Incels** exaggerate the phenomenon of the Alpha Widow to rationalize their giving up on women. This doesn’t invalidate the phenomenon. Critics generally drop this misconception of the Red Pill would rather *poison the well* than address a concept that rattles their comforting perceptions of women.

I understand how it might be convenient to disqualify the concept based on the bitterness of the individual

piecing together why his wife or girlfriend still seems to be having a relationship with her ex even if just in her head. Self-loathing **Incels** use this as an excuse to *give up* because they believe Hypergamy is an insurmountable obstacle in connecting with the *juice* they don't want to bother with the *squeeze* to get.

For the record, no, not all women turn into Alpha Widows. All women are Hypergamous, but buffers, a strong sense of self, and learned self-control have historically been the checks and balances needed to protect against the Alpha Widow dynamic.

The problem is these buffers are popularly considered sexual repression of women today. Women simply won't police the worst aspects of their mating strategy. **Any** personal, political, or social interference that would prevent a woman from exercising her Hypergamous sexuality is viewed as misogynist, sexist repression.

Statistically, women with more sexual partners have a higher incidence of divorce, report lower marital satisfaction and find it more difficult to form healthy attachments in LTRs relative to their **Body Count**. On the other hand, men are not similarly affected by a high **Body Count**. Why?

Because men and women have different evolved mating strategies and priorities, men have a much easier time compartmentalizing the sex act and separating it from the emotional investment women necessarily apply to sex.

Men's natural attraction to pornography is a good illustration of this, but this difference is reflected in men's and women's evolved mating strategies. Survival made it necessary for men to breed quickly and move quickly - *ejaculate and evacuate*. Our sexuality is always-on; women's sexuality is cyclic and comparatively slower to prompt.

Today we live in a social order where Hypergamy is unfettered and unbuffered. Women have more access to

men and have more opportunities to be imprinted upon by Alpha men in their peak fertility years than at any other time in history. This perceived abundance of reproductive options and lack of social stigma or moral reservations puts women into a position where settling on an average man seems like a crime against themselves.

Average women do not want to settle on average men. Having sex with an average man is like cheating on the ***One that got away, or that still might be.***

Average men then turn their sexual frustration into hate for the “*Players*” who violated and ruined their “soulmate” before he came into her life. They refuse to acknowledge that in most cases, his girl eagerly chose to give herself to the man she told her husband was a “Player” from her past.

Blue Pill married men have the hardest time accepting that their wives may be Alpha Widows for a man who came before them – even if she doesn’t openly pine for him. Average men struggle with the idea that their wives gave a part of themselves to a guy they’ll never experience and did so free from the rules and qualifications she makes for him. Denial of, or anger at, the Player who *damaged* her becomes his ego’s protection.

Game Maxim #41: Average men always throw shade at the men who have the Game to seduce women.

They hate the Player because they “***ruin women for great guys like him.***” They’ll turn it into a moral issue for those men or a personality flaw because it absolves their wives of their modern mating choices.

Game Applications

Knowledge is power in life and Game. In the PUA forums of the mid-2000s, there came a brief push for *Ethical Game*. The idea was simple - "*Leave her better than you found her.*" The more mercenary Players of the time felt terrible about what they saw happening to the *Plates* they were spinning or the Same Night Lays (SNL) they managed to *F-Close*.

There were Players whose Game was so effective, that they saw women emotionally investing in them when they parted ways. They were the five minutes of Alpha who would trump five years of Beta. And, depending on the woman, they may become overly attached to the Player as a potential long-term mate. Effectively, Game created Alpha Widows and made men the hated Players that average men blamed for damaging *their* future women.

Ethical Game was short-lived. Firstly, PUAs of the time didn't have the skills to leave that kind of a mark on a woman's soul. Second, those who had that impact didn't have much incentive to think about the effect they were leaving while spinning several plates in their rosters.

However, *Ethical Game* died because, by its very nature, men's and women's mating strategies are adversarial. Thus came the Cardinal Rule of Mating Strategies...

THE CARDINAL RULE OF MATING STRATEGIES

FOR ONE SEX'S MATING STRATEGY TO SUCCEED, THE OTHER'S
MUST BE COMPROMISED OR ABANDONED.

Understand this, unless you intend to make her a permanent fixture in your life, **there is no way to leave a woman better than you found her.** The very act of *Gaming* her implies at least the possibility of something long-term. Even *fuck buddies* still hold a faint hope for something more. To date, a woman non-exclusively requires that she compromise her mating strategy to facilitate your own.

For young women, this means she is investing the agency of her prime sexual market value peak years into the prospect that you will eventually commit to something more permanent. Young women wrapped up in the newness of sex with a high-value, noncommittal guy rarely make this distinction. After the novelty has worn off and she's been part of your roster for three months, you get The Talk and a push for *something more*.

It becomes an issue of opportunity cost for her. **Women's *only* real agency with men is their sexuality.** Despite all the social conventions that lead them to think otherwise, all women know this. However, that agency is perishable over time and compromised by her habits, diet, physique, prior children, and her ego.

You will never leave a woman better than you found her. She is compromising her future long-term security by betting *her* sexual agency on you compromising *your* sexual strategy (for hers) at a later date.

If the sex is good, and your fantasy is good, you can draw out the time she stays on your roster. However, the longer she remains in that state, the more likely you will become the Alpha she's *widowed* by. This is a fact that most

notch counter PUAs never address for their *students*. If there is ever such a thing as *Ethical Game*, it's in your judgment as to when to cut her loose - or to Game a particular woman.

Average men are not cut out for the necessary emotional detachment that's ultimately in a woman's best interest. A majority of Beta men wouldn't dream of *spinning plates* in the first place, but to electively breakup with a woman is counterintuitive. Average men live in a state of sexual scarcity. They do everything humanly possible to qualify themselves for the intimacy they believe they don't deserve from a woman.

This is the mindset that you must unlearn as a Player.

If you want to enjoy the intimacy of many women and later become monogamous with a worthy woman, you ***must*** replace your mindset of scarcity with an air of abundance. Even the best-looking, most affluent men still suffer from the *Scarcity Mindset*.

Despite all their inherent advantages in the sexual marketplace, their scarcity thinking hobbles them with women. Average men are conditioned from childhood to *pedestalize* women. They learn default *respect* for women that is not based on merit but rather a cheap self-evincing form of care that's only defined by femaleness.

That mindset carries over into adulthood for average men and fosters scarcity thinking. To think otherwise risks coming off as arrogant, egotistical, misogynist, unsupportive, and *disrespectful* to women. That is counterintuitive to the average man whose sexual opportunities are few and far between.

This is why *Plate Spinning* - dating non-exclusively - is anathema to average men. Players are *manipulators* and evil because they dare to put their mating strategy above

women's mating strategy. She compromises her strategy to facilitate yours.

In that arrangement, the possibility exists that you will be *The Best She Can Do*, thus making you the unavoidable Alpha from whom she is widowed later.

That's not *always* the case, but a good Player understands that you must set yourself apart from the average man who wants a woman's attention to be considered a player himself.

HYPERGAMY: THE MISCONCEPTIONS

Of all the concepts I'm known for, one rises above all the rest — **Hypergamy**. I've often written about *Hypergamy* that I *owned* the term on Google for a few years. If you searched "Hypergamy" between 2014 and 2017, *The Rational Male* would be the first return you'd get after the Wikipedia entry.

If you search now, you'll get all sorts of returns from gender-pundits and dating *coaches* putting their spin on what I (and many guys on the *SoSuave* forums) outlined about Hypergamy decades ago.

Hypergamy is women's evolved mating strategy - Alpha Fucks/Beta Bucks. That's the Manosphere euphemism for women's selection process when solving their reproductive problem. It's a constant search to solve a two-sided equation in mating. Find a man who best exemplifies short-term (proximate) sexual, genetic benefits with long-term (ultimate) provisioning, protection, and parental investment survival benefits.

This is basically what Hypergamy boils down to: Alpha Seed, Beta Need. Cads vs. Dads, and ***The hot guy in the foam cannon party*** vs. ***Boyfriend Material***. Exciting, emotional, sexual stimulation balanced with comforting, dependable long-term security.

This isn't a complicated formula to wrap your head around. People go off the rails by interpreting it in context with their estimate of women in a Gynocentric social order. In that social framework, relating unflattering facts about women's nature is risky, especially for men taught to be as complimentary and accommodating as possible to women if they ever hope to get laid.

This is problematic for gender *influencers* who don't want to "alienate half their audience" with inconvenient truths about women. Hypergamy either becomes this

shibboleth for bitter *Incels* or downplayed according to a woman's quality and capacity for self-regulation. In either extreme, this makes for many misconceptions about what Hypergamy is and its influence on women.

I've written a lot about Hypergamy in all of my previous books, but here I'm going to address the common (and often deliberate) misconceptions about Hypergamy. I see a lot of misinformation floating around Red Pill forums and the YouTube channels of "life coaches" who dismiss Hypergamy as a "thing."

Some of these are honest mistakes. Some are just the opinions of guys who only see one side of the Hypergamous equation. Some critics think Hypergamy is all there is to Red Pill awareness. While women's sexual strategies expand into our social order, there's much more to understanding intersexual dynamics than just Hypergamy.

As new readers become initiated in Red Pill awareness, I can't expect them to have read every essay describing the ins and outs of Hypergamy. So, in the interests of clearing the air and consolidating all of these misunderstandings for everyone's benefit - and to refute the disingenuous - I'm going to run down the most common Hypergamous hate I see here:

Hypergamy is a Straitjacket

This is the most common misperception. Hypergamy is an evolved behavioral dynamic, not a social dynamic. Any social norm that coincides with Hypergamy begins from the biological origin of Hypergamy.

That is to say, the practices of Hypergamy are the behavioral extension of physical factors, most notably *Ovulatory Shift* in women, and the practicality of securing the best genetic benefits with the best provisioning benefits from single or multiple men. Hypergamy is a sexual strategy exclusive to women. It is the most practical behavioral plan that aligns with women's biological realities.

At its root level, hypergamy is about the most productive, pragmatic means of women becoming fertile with the best genetic breeding opportunities and simultaneously pairing in the long-term provisioning opportunities available to a woman.

At first sight, Hypergamy seems a lot like a straitjacket. If you measure up, you're golden. If you don't, you're fucked. It's an either-or extreme. As such, it paints Hypergamy as something insurmountable and very deterministic. If you weren't "born Alpha," you're going to go extinct. I admit I've read well-meaning Red Pill guys triumphantly and defeatedly cop to this idea about Hypergamy.

They fail to consider that women's circumstances modify their capacity to optimize Hypergamy relative to their Sexual Market Value (SMV). I've seen low SMV Pickup Artists pull off what, to this mindset, should be impossible. Looks are what most of the *straitjacket* set obsessively dwell upon. If you're unable to constantly perform up to a

woman's overblown sense of entitlement to the *best she can do*, you're screwed.

This is the ***Dancing Monkey*** fallacy. The juice isn't worth the squeeze; even when you perform up to expectations, you're not the *real you*, and she's always looking for the *bigger and better deal* anyway - especially when you're underperforming. *Why bother?*

It is an easy sell for Black Pill Doomers who didn't want to bother with the squeeze anyway. When *positivity hustlers* and TradCons see this attitude in guys they think are "Red Pill," they use this to sell their brand of pushback on the caricatures they create of PUAs and Red Pill content creators.

They'll tell you healthy, undamaged women are incredible. They can all self-police the worst aspects of Hypergamy, and any "Red Pill" guy schlepping *dating advice* telling you different is just a bitter *Incel* whose mommy didn't love him enough. Both of these extremes are hindrances to understanding how Hypergamy influences women's psychology and behavior.

There is more to Hypergamy than just a man's Looks. Some factors, variables, and circumstances influence the expression of Hypergamy, and there is nothing deterministic about it. Yes, Hypergamy is often ruthless, but resigning yourself to binary extremes about it gets you nowhere.

The better course of action is to accept it for what it is and learn to leverage it to your best advantage. Age, weight, environment, ethnicity, culture, upbringing, single-motherhood, and religious convictions all contribute to the context in which women express Hypergamy. All women are Hypergamous, but effecting it is subject to conditions.

Hypergamy is ONLY defined as “*marrying upward*”

This is usually tossed out by low-information critics who hear about how Hypergamy is *so important to those Red Pill guys*. Their first impulse is to look up the dictionary or Wikipedia definition of “*Hypergamy*” and then dismiss any broader understanding as *Incels* just making up stuff.

Yes, sociologists coined the original term in the 1950s to describe women’s “tendency to marry upward into higher socioeconomic strata” while studying the caste system in India. However, the word deserves a much broader definition regarding the biological and psychological realities we observe in women today.

Critics fixate on semantics and terms because they don’t think *those Red Pill guys* have any business rewriting terminology without a doctorate in psychology. We could create some new term that would describe the phenomenon, but Hypergamy describes it in the abstract just as well. Critics resorting to this dismissal only seek to discredit the one proposing an idea based on terminology – which is stupid.

Some women are more Hypergamous than others

This is usually trotted out by critics of “Not All Women Are Like That” (NAWALT). Most, of course, are women. There are also the ‘*Quality Woman*’ seekers who want to believe that the *unicorn* they married wouldn’t be **as** Hypergamous as the average skank on the constant lookout for the bigger and better deal.

In this case, rather than biological determinism, Hypergamy takes on an aspect of social conditioning and becomes part of women’s personality. If a woman is smart or raised the *right* way, she’s not **as** Hypergamous as women raised wrong. This locks into the Blank Slate and Social Constructionism belief that have conveniently excused women’s and derided men’s behaviors for centuries.

While it’s true that acculturation and learned social practices can be a buffer against Hypergamous excess, it doesn’t lessen or dissolve Hypergamy’s influence in women. Just as men’s sexuality is learned to be reigned in, so too can Hypergamy be learned to be controlled. In our post-Sexual Revolution era, *Fempowerment* has unfettered those old social buffers for women.

Learning Hypergamous restraint is viewed as male-chauvinist repression of women’s sexuality. We expect women to police the worst of Hypergamy with no actual instruction. Since the mid-60s, the unspoken expectation has been that women are self-aware enough to buffer the worst aspects of Hypergamy. Since the Boomer generation, we’ve believed women’s empathy and prudence would override the influence of Hypergamy. The men of today are paying the price of that foolishness.

Game Maxim #42: *All women are Hypergamous.*

Some have learned to curb its excesses. Some live in cultural environments that limit, repress or moderate it, but ***all*** women are Hypergamous to the same biological degree. All that changes is the context in which Hypergamy is expressed in women. It is a misconception to think of Hypergamy in terms of the behavior it prompts. Hypergamy is a dynamic, not a verb. The girl in your Bible study group is just as *Hypergamous* as the girl you got the same night lay with in the club. They just express it in different contexts.

Both men and women are Hypergamous

I'll cover this fallacy in the following chapter, but briefly, Hypergamy is a sexual strategy unique to women. Men and women have different adversarial mating strategies until parental investment becomes the focus of both. Women have attraction/arousal floors for men with whom they will reproduce and settle into pair bonding.

Women only consider an equal to, or better than, arrangement about the sexual market value of a man in contrast to (what they perceive as) their own SMV. Men will date and have sex with women who are (sometimes) two to three steps below their own SMV. **Hypergamy never seeks its level.**

It is in women's evolutionary interests to seek an advantage in the mating game. Men simply seek opportunities to reproduce. As Billy Crystal used to say, "*Women need a reason to have sex; men just need a place.*" This is what defines each sex's mating imperatives.

Men and women are different.

An equalist mindset always presupposes we are the same (or more alike than different). Because of this, the *False Equivalency* argument is always the go-to response for Hypergamy. If we accept that women are Hypergamous, then men being equals **must** also be Hypergamous.

This misguided yin-yang equivalency refocuses the unflattering truth about women onto men to even the scales and the blame. The idea that for every action, there must be an equal and opposite reaction, in this sense, is false.

Hypergamy is overemphasized in the Manosphere!

As women openly embrace Hypergamy, men become more sensitive to their (often ugly) roles in that strategy. This awareness means women must mitigate the importance Hypergamy plays in men's lives because most men don't like the idea of being exploited. Which then goes back to the straitjacket notion.

Men accept Hypergamy, but they ignore its more significant influence on social and political dynamics. It will always sound conspiratorial, but women's interests define "correct" discourse in a feminine-primary, gynocentric social order. We read how western society has become overly politically correct, but I argue we are extremely "***female-correct.***"

When women are afforded unchecked power, their first imperative is using it to accommodate the Feminine Imperative. Women's Hypergamous interests influence and dictate social standards, legislation, and political discourse.

This is not something average men want to consider. However, it's easier to dismiss the nuts & bolts of Hypergamy by overemphasizing its importance to the men who are calling it out. Critics use this Straw Man tactic to reframe and refocus the conversation away from the downstream effects of women influencing societies.

If *those Red Pill guys* are *obsessed with Hypergamy*, you're less likely to give credence to Gynocentrism when the Manosphere sorts out more complex gender issues.

Hypergamy only applies to men with the best social/provisioning status

This one-sided perspective is promoted by the likes of *Dr. Jordan Peterson*. The idea is this: In women's natural benevolence, they will **only** be *attracted* to the man who best satisfies their *needs* for long-term security and parental investment. **This idea myopically ignores the Alpha Fucks side of the Hypergamous equation.**

The *attraction-only* concept is very complimentary to women. Guys who define Hypergamy by the inherent goodness of women also tend to define *Alpha* in terms of men being pro-social, leaders of business and community. This is false on many levels, but it's satisfying for men who believe that women'll eventually reward them for their virtuousness.

This misconception deliberately ignores women's visceral interest in short-term mating. Alpha Fucks isn't a *thing* - or it's reserved for *low-quality women* - especially if your only frame of reference for sex is transactional. Therefore, Hypergamy is only about forming long-term relationships with the guy whose money, status, affluence, and dependability make him women's best choice. It's all Beta Bucks that make a woman wet for them.

Men who've experienced women's genuine, feral desire for validation sex *with them* know that Hypergamy is two-sided. But the **Power Beta** mindset needs to believe that women base their sexuality and emotional investments on well-considered criteria of a man's status. They rationalize that when a woman cheats or chooses another man instead of him, he's failed regarding status, affluence, dependability, meeting her needs, etc.

They intentionally ignore women's visceral nature, which has little to do with a man's status or wealth. It's

why rich women still want to fuck the pool boy. On some level, men realize that they cannot sexually compete with rival men in physical prowess. So, they must change the game to conform to what they can control.

Changing that game requires reinforcing the belief (in themselves and others) that women's sexual selection is based on what they possess. Quality, righteous, undamaged women naturally *want* what they got - Beta Bucks in spades.

It's men who are responsible for Hypergamy

This is a reversal of the origins of Hypergamy. Again, this relies on a social construction perspective. Moralists trot this out to complement their hope that women might find virtue attractive in men. This presupposes men are the true power brokers, and via a nebulous Patriarchy, Hypergamy is something men are in control of.

This misconception agrees with the myth of male power. It also reverses the origin of male dominance hierarchies. It presumes those hierarchies exist separate from the women who perpetuate them through Hypergamy and upward sexual selection.

This misconception appeals to men who've bought into the "***Man Up for the Red Pill***" ideology. Since men are in control, women are only as Hypergamous as men allow them to be. In specific cultural contexts, there's some truth in this; however, in the global sexual marketplace, it is women who are deciding for themselves how Hypergamous they wish to be. And they've got the full force of the law and social norms to enforce their choices.

Understand, I'm all for men establishing the dominant *Frame* women naturally want from men. However, it's self-defeating for men to believe that women don't understand how their sexual strategy works and how they can best leverage it, yet they shouldn't be held accountable. Women are pragmatists pretending to be romantics.

Women are not better or worse because men allowed or ignored their decisions to be so. Ironically, men subscribing to the mantra of personal responsibility and free will are most likely to blame the ills of women's choices on themselves. ***Hypergamy isn't a choice.*** How women express it is and ultimately bear the responsibility for its consequences is on women – *not* men.

Hypergamy means only 20% of men will *ever* get laid

Newsflash: Beta men can - and do - get laid. Twisting the 80/20 rule is the worst distortion of Hypergamy. Critics think the *Pareto Principle* promotes self-defeat in Red Pill noobs. Again, the concern is that men become despondent because they'll classify themselves in the 80% of guys who don't get laid and *never* will because of Hypergamy.

This defeatist theme gets carried over to a lot of these misconceptions. Dating *Pill* "coaches" are very concerned their clients will just give up and go MGTOW or Black Pill because that *Rollo* guy showed them the ugliest side of Hypergamy, and they get nihilistic. Where's the positivity, man?

The distortion of the 80/20 rule usually goes something like this: "***What Rollo is saying is that 20% of guys are fucking 80% of the girls. How ridiculous!***"

These guys are deliberately misconstruing 80/20. In Red Pill terms, the *Pareto Principle* is best illustrated in the recent studies of online dating that show most men find most women at least somewhat attractive. In contrast, women view 80% of men as below average in attractiveness. Men liked more than 60% of female profiles, while women rated 80% of men as *unattractive* and ***liked*** only 4.5% of male profiles.

That 80% of men who women view as unattractive is where the 80 part of the 80/20 rule came from. The Red Pill seduction community called this out in the early 2000s. The very disingenuous misconception is that **20% of guys are fucking 80% of women** when data shows it's really **100% of women are interested in the top 20% of men** - and **only 4.5% of men prompt women to make something happen!**

Hypergamy never seeks its own level. Regarding sexual market value, women aren't looking for a lateral move when mating. The 80/20 rule applies to women's interpretation of men's value, not 20% of men fiendishly banging all but the lowest percentile of ugly women they leave for average men.

Hypergamy requires trust on the part of women

No, it really doesn't. What this premise ignores is the dual nature of Hypergamy. Trust has nothing to do with the sexual urgency a woman feels for a "hawt" guy while she's in the proliferative phase of her menstrual cycle.

Trust, rapport, and comfort are post-orgasm emotional conditions.

These feelings are reserved for the Beta Provisioning side of Hypergamy, usually associated with the security/nesting needs in the luteal phase of menstruation. This is why the average men, who women *trust*, are the first guys they call to cry about the guy they fucked who never had to earn her *trust*. The idea that trust is always a prerequisite for sex is just stupid, but it does illustrate the Hypergamous process from both the Alpha Fucks and Beta Bucks sides.

Men should stay ignorant of Hypergamy for their own good

This is based on the idea that average men made aware of the visceral aspects of Hypergamy become angry with women, grow despondent, or kill themselves thinking they'll never measure up to women's standards. If you're familiar with my work, you'll know I have an obligation to objective truth.

Would you rather be happy, or would you rather be right?

Ideally, you'd say both, but it usually starts that you have to pick one even when that's possible. More often, you have to be *right* to get to *happy*. The truth *will* set you free, but it doesn't make it pretty, and it doesn't absolve you of the responsibility that comes with knowing that truth.

I get that guys are hopeful they can find a formula that'll get them their dream girls without much effort. Telling them that's not going to work for them makes them hopeless. Hope is just waiting around for other people to do what you know needs to be done yourself.

They still cling to Blue Pill ideals being achieved with Red Pill truths. Indeed, most average men aren't prepared to have the hope they staked to old order ideals about women erased for them. But, the "Keep the guys in the dark for their own good" notion is a misguided way of helping you become something more by keeping you ignorant.

As painful as it can be initially, it's better to sort out the truth for yourself to get to happiness based on something real.

Hypergamy just gives women an “out” for bad, evil treatment of men

This is a play on the personal responsibility trope. We listen to women repeat it all the time: ***We are not our sisters' keeper***. It all comes down to the capacity men believe women have or don't have about their personal agency. All this misconception does is apply a layer of moralism to Hypergamy while asking does life just happens to women or do women happen to live? This is the question of women's ***Hypoagency***.

Hypoagency is the idea that certain individuals (e.g., women) lack *agency* in their actions. They lack control. They are not actors. Instead, they are acted upon. The corollary to this is that women are not responsible for their actions if they have no agency to make a free choice.

The cultural narrative of the empowered, **Strong Independent Woman®** is entirely at odds with the idea of women's hypoagency. They are powerful and purposeful when it serves, yet unaccountable and blameless when it's inconvenient.

In the early days of pickup, the book, ***The Selfish Gene*** was being bandied about the Manosphere. The concern was men using the premise of the selfish gene to absolve them of cheating on their girlfriend or used as an excuse for promiscuity. They just couldn't help it. *The Devil made me do it* becomes; my *selfish DNA made me do it*. The same idea is now used by moralists promoting the reverse; Men are responsible for Hypergamy because women's DNA makes them blameless.

Thus, women are *acted upon* by a Hypergamy written into their DNA. They can use it to excuse unethical behavior and the ugliest results. The logic then follows that women are either active agents in their sexual selection

choices and have moral agency, or they lack that agency and need men to provide the self-control women are incapable of.

Sorry if that's a bit philosophical for a book on Game. I think it's a combination of the two. Women do have agency for which they are responsible and accountable, but also need to provide a confident, dominant *Frame* to which women genuinely desire to submit. It is not men's fault that women are Hypergamous, but if there is to be a healthy control of it for the best interests of both men and women, men must understand it and master it.

I would say the same of men's own impulsive sexuality and expression of it – however, historically, men have been overwhelmingly held accountable for not mastering it.

Women aren't slaves to Hypergamy

This is one more question of women's agency. Just as hypoagency and biology are used to absolve women of responsibility, women's *awareness* of Hypergamy is another way to excuse bad behavior. I've never stated that women are "slaves" to Hypergamy. To my knowledge, no Red Pill guru worth his salt has made this claim either.

Most women don't realize they are giving a guy a shit test; it's just part of their mental subroutines. Likewise, women don't *consciously* plan their girls' night out to coincide with the proliferative phase of their menstrual cycle. This does happen, but they don't intend the coordination. Women aren't **slaves** to Hypergamy, but they aren't immune to its influence.

Women are Hypergamous; men are Hypogamous

I've heard *Purple Pill* men try to explain this: If Hypergamy is women's innate preference to marry up, **Hypogamy is the idea that men naturally look to marry down.** Hypogamy is the misguided explanation for the necessity of women to marry down in the face of men's socioeconomic status is less than that of women's.

The salient point is that there is no natural element in men that would suggest anything about men opting for Hypogamy. If anything, Hypogamy as a behavioral preference would eventually select itself out as a mating strategy. Men are opportunistic breeders. Our innate mating strategy is unlimited access to unlimited sexuality.

Ejaculating and evacuating was not only the best practice for men in our ancestral past; it was a survival adaptation. It's the primary reason men, not women, can easily dissociate the sex act from emotional investment. It's also why porn will always be popular with men. Men don't *seek* to mate down; they seek to mate at *all*.

The concept of Hypogamy stupidly presupposes men's mating interests inherently align with women's long-term mating strategy. Not only does this notion reinforce "female-correct" thinking, but it's also another hope to balance Hypergamy with the *Blank Slate*. If Hypogamy is a thing, it's a sociological phenomenon, not an innate strategy.

Men's mating imperative is unlimited access to unlimited sexuality, and this we can see manifested in our behavior. It would never be in men's reproductive best interests to seek out Hypogamous monogamy when it's more efficient to hit it and quit it. Sometimes, marrying down may be inevitable, but this is a downstream effect, not an evolved drive.

After marriage, Hypergamy should end

Oh man, wouldn't that be nice? Actually, no, it would put men and women in a state of personal stagnation. While I try never to deal with what "should be," I recognize that there are guys who believe that all the anxiety they felt in their dating years should fade to absolute comfort after they get married.

This is false for many reasons, but then there is the extreme reversal; "Aww man, if I'm not the highest apex Alpha in my wife's world, she'll cheat on me with him as soon as ***Chad Thundercock*** takes an interest in her."

Critics overplay this stupid binary to prove that "women are people too." Hypergamy isn't even a thing for a good woman once she's settled in with a great guy like you. Remember, Hypergamy is always in effect for women by order of degree. Marriage is no insulation from the sexual marketplace.

After a formal commitment, you fool yourself into ever getting comfortable (or vulnerable). Guys who buy into this fallacy are usually equalists who believe their *Burden of Performance* ended when they said, "I do."

That said, it's not all gloom and doom. If you've established a solid dominant *Frame* before marriage, the older a woman gets, Hypergamy works in your favor. Studies show that women in unsatisfying long-term relationships or marriages sought extra-pair sex with more masculine men during their proliferative ovulation phase.

However, the same studies **also** showed that women in ***satisfying relationships*** were more sexually proceptive (horny) for the men they were paired with in the same ovulatory phase.

Hypergamy is only about Alpha Fucks

Looks-Maxxers love to overplay the importance of looks and Alpha dominance in the Hypergamous equation. This is the flip side to the status, affluence, and dependability-are-all impression of Hypergamy. Looks and confident dominance (bordering on cocky arrogance) stimulate tingles most viscerally, but that's not the entirety of the Hypergamous equation.

Looks Maxers will belabor the importance of physique and height without considering congruence in behavior that can be anti-seductive. **Looks will cover many Game sins**, but Game savvy, congruence, and emotional impact will always carry you further.

There are two sides to Hypergamy, Alpha Fucks, and Beta Bucks. In today's world, women's primary focus is on the Alpha Fucks side of that equation, but it doesn't mean the Beta Bucks provisioning side has been erased. A good-looking *Creep* is still a creep.

Hypergamy isn't so important; you're overstating things

This is a common form of Player hate. Guys who obsess over Hypergamy are losers who *react* to women instead of having women react to him.

To illustrate this, let's look at the story of *Daniella Greene*. Daniella was an FBI translator. One day she left her virtuous military husband in the U.S. and flew around the world to marry the very same ISIS warlord she'd been tasked with investigating by the FBI. Google her name after you finish this chapter.

Think about how many Red Pill truths her story confirms. Now think about how the greater scope and society-wide importance of understanding intersexual dynamics and Hypergamy factors into Daniella's international incident that possibly threatened national security.

There are plenty of other examples of this in the news today. Are we just going to say, "*Well, bitches be crazy, she must be damaged,*" or are we better off seeing the mechanics behind her actions with a Red Pill Lens? Look at the significance of Hypergamy influencing everything from divorce laws to child custody to abortion.

Hypergamy is a much larger dynamic than most men want to digest. It's not being reactionary or obsessing over Hypergamy to see the forest for the trees.

HYPERGAMY: FALSE EQUIVALENCIES

Is there's a parallel to Hypergamy in men? What's good for the goose must necessarily be good for the gander, right? To square the egalitarian circle of Hypergamy for Blank Slate equalists, it's often said that men and women are both Hypergamous. This isn't true. Both men and women optimize, but **only women are Hypergamous**.

Hypergamy has become a term of art in the Manosphere. It has a particular meaning which differs from the meaning social scientists ascribe to it. In social science, it refers specifically and only to marriage relationships.

The term refers to women marrying men who are perceived to be wealthier or of a higher socioeconomic standing or caste, usually observed in Hindu cultures on the Indian subcontinent and observed in early American society. In the United States, it's often referred to as women "marrying up."

F. Roger Devlin, himself having a social science background, appropriated the term in his essay entitled *Sexual Utopia in Power* when referring to his observation that young single women always seemed to be looking for the best man they can get at any one time, seeking the most attractive man or men for sex.

Devlin observed modern Western women's propensity to discard one man in favor of a better man, in serial fashion, always doing their best to "move up" and get a more attractive, better man with each successive discard and pairing.

Expanding on this, Manosphere writers noticed that Hypergamy operates at a low hum. It's like a background operating system in every woman. It is *satisfied* while she's with a man of sufficiently high value. But if a man of perceived higher value or greater attractiveness shows

interest, and her current man's value is faltering, that low hum becomes a loud alarm.

This can cause her, at the very least, to have feelings of attraction for the new man and feelings of dis-attraction for the current man. This can, in many cases, cause her to leave her current man for the new higher value, more attractive man.

This doesn't always happen, but it *can* happen. Hypergamy can operate in any combination - more attractive man showing interest; current man's attractiveness waning or falling, and anywhere in between. Thus, the Manosphere's use of the term "Hypergamy" referred to a core aspect of female sexual nature unique to women.

This sums up the conflict in the definition that Red Pill critics have in understanding why there is a need for a broader definition of Hypergamy. "Hypergamy" serves well in a more comprehensive capacity, but as critics find the broader definition unflattering to women, they dismiss it as illegitimate because the Manosphere appropriated the term.

We see feminine-primary society embrace the more significant ideas of Hypergamy so long as they're flattering to female nature and benefit women most. Once it gets ugly, it conveniently denies the legitimacy of the broad definition. Now it's strictly a "women tending to marry up" sociology term.

People confuse "optimization" with "Hypergamy."

Both men and women *optimize*, meaning they want the best they can get of anything and everything. Men and women optimize everything: jobs, cars, houses, furniture, friends, even churches. Men and women also optimize with

each other. But men and women optimize with the opposite sex in different ways. This is where the confusion comes in.

In its current iteration in the Manosphere, Hypergamy essentially means, “Is attracted only to more attractive people than I am.” Women will be sexually attracted to men they perceive as “above” them in attractiveness. They will be somewhat attracted to men who are at their rough SMV level, but that man must bring other things to the table, *usually* provisioning and commitment before she will have sex with him. Today, it can simply come down to feral lust and physical arousal.

Still, even on the Alpha Fucks side of Hypergamy, women are never sexually attracted to men who are perceived to be beneath their SMV level.

Example: A woman with an SMV of 7 will be sexually attracted to males with an SMV of 8 and up. She will pair with an SMV 7 man if, and only if, he brings “other things” to the table. She will never be sexually attracted to male 6s on down. She will easily get sex with men above her in SMV.

She can occasionally get **relationships** with male 8s. She can easily get **relationships** and **sex** with male 7s. Male 6s are her orbiters, with whom she’ll never have sex but will entertain for purposes of attention and the possibility that one might move up in SMV in the future.

Female critics of the broad definition of Hypergamy have a problem with distinguishing between optimization and Hypergamy.

Much of this comes from women’s sense of their sexual market value being largely overinflated in the social media age. Women rate 80% of men as below average in attractiveness.

When you contrast, even loose, statistics like this against the broader idea of Hypergamy, you start to see why women would want there to be some similar kind of Hypergamy for men. Hypergamy in women is founded on three bedrock truths:

- **Hypergamous Doubt:** A persistent doubt that a woman has adequately 'optimized' Hypergamy with any man she has, or will potentially have, consolidated on in a long-term relationship.
- **Hypergamy never seeks its level:** Evolutionary efficiency dictates women are always *looking* for a better-than-equal value pairing with men relative to their own SMV. When 80% of men are deemed below average in attractiveness, we have to consider this assessment is measured by how women's Hypergamous equation would be optimized with acceptable or unacceptable men.
- **Hypergamy is dualistic:** Hypergamy is two-sided. The Manosphere euphemism for this is Alpha Fucks and Beta Bucks. This shorthand refers to Hypergamy seeking optimization in short-term sex, reproduction potential, and (ideally) long-term parental investment, protection, and security potential.

It's important to review these principles of Hypergamy. For all the protestations of women wanting an equal comparison of Hypergamy in men, there are no parallels of Hypergamy in men's sexual strategy. Men do not operate like this at all. That's the inherent difference.

Men are not attracted **only** to women who are above them in SMV. A man can be attracted to women above him in SMV, at his SMV level, and women below him in SMV. Based on his and her comparative SMV, what is also

different is the level of women he can get and how well his relationships will work out.

A man will be unable to sustain a relationship with a woman above his SMV indefinitely. He is very sexually attracted to them and occasionally lucks out and gets sex with one or two, but he can't sustain a relationship. He can get sex from women at his SMV level, but only if he goes all-in and offers commitment. He can most easily get sex with women below him in SMV, often with no-strings-attached sex.

This dynamic coincides with the **Cardinal Rule of Game - *Women make rules for Betas and break the rules for Alphas***. Women make rules for men at, or rarely below, their own perceived SMV. In an equal pairing (a 7 with a 7, for example), that man *must* bring something more to the table to offset Hypergamy if he is to sustain that relationship.

This is where the *rules*-making aspect for Betas comes into play. He must qualify and prove he has tangible benefits - value-added - that offset his lateral SMV.

Example: A male 6 will rarely get sex with a 7 but can't keep anything going with her. He's not even on the radar of female 8s on up. He can only get sex with a female 6 if he offers commitment, provisioning, and dependability. And then only if he can continually prove his quality. He can most easily get sex with female 5s on down irrespective of value-added.

Here's a grand difference: A man is okay with having sex with women at and below his own SMV.

In fact, he'll be happiest in his relationships with women beneath his own SMV. A woman is indifferent about sex with men at her own SMV. She is positively repulsed and sickened at having sex with men below her own SMV.

Even the thought of sex with a suboptimal man triggers revulsion in women because it's emotionally connected to women's *Existential Fear* of having Hypergamous choice removed from her. She'll be happiest in a relationship with a man above her own SMV. She can tolerate a man at her SMV so long as he brings side benefits or the potential to outclass her in SMV later in life. At best, she will be miserable with a man beneath her SMV and tend to blow up those relationships.

Game Maxim #43: *Men and women both have attraction floors. Men's attraction floor is below their own SMV. Women's attraction floor is above her own SMV, and occasionally at her own SMV, but never beneath it.*

Recall the **Cardinal Rule of Sexual Strategies: *For one gender's sexual strategy to succeed, the other gender must compromise or abandon their own.***

The other minor difference here is that men are innately polygamous, not Hypergamous. A man's imperative is not (necessarily) to get the **best** woman. It's unlimited access to unlimited sexuality with as little investment and commitment as possible.

If he can do it, he would love to get as many women as possible at and a little below his own SMV and have sex with as many of them as possible for as long as possible, without committing to or investing in any of them. That's spinning plates. Most men don't do this because **they can't** – by current standards, at least 80% of them are not attractive enough.

A woman's imperative is to get the best man she can get for sex and provisioning.

That's why you don't see many women "dating" (i.e., having sex with) several different men simultaneously. The ones who do are incentivized to keep it quiet while sorting out which man is their best option. Women do spin plates, but they pick the best plate they can and take care of it as best they can.

Instead of trying to collect plates, they just change out the plates, one for another, when a bigger, better one comes along. This is why the best long-term relationship is when the man outranks his woman in SMV. He should be at least +1 and preferably +2 in SMV. This makes both of them happiest in the long run.

The more high-minded of my critics think the "male imperative" is setting the bar too low for men. This comes from wanting something more than the visceral truth of what motivates us. I agree with this for the most part. Men need to become something more than what their base natures would have of them.

But, using the same reproductive metric in describing Hypergamy, I've also recognized that men's drive for sex has been the incentive for our most significant achievements and worst atrocities. If we are to be ethical in our judgments, we must be amoral in our assessments. Sometimes those assessments will be unflattering for men and women.

The objective issue here is that men's imperative is not analogous to women's imperative. When we look at men's approach to gratifying this imperative, we see the stark contrast between women's Hypergamy and men's sexual strategy.

False Equivalencies

Whenever I or any Red Pill man relates some unflattering truth about the nature of women, without fail, the reflexive response is, “**Well, men do this too, and it’s worse....**” They refocus the issue on some other unflattering presumption about the nature of men that’s supposed to provide a counterbalance to the ugly truth about women.

This is to be expected. The impulse is to defend against anyone acknowledging that truth by distraction. “**Ooh, ooh, men do it too!**” is a reframe meant to focus the intent of objectively assessing what is otherwise an unflattering aspect of female nature. To do so, we are expected to assume a co-equal state between men and women and a co-equal state of mutual goals. There must be an agreed state of equivalency between men and women for women’s distraction to be effective.

As such, we are, by default, expected to accept that if there is a female Hypergamy, there must also be a male form of Hypergamy. This is the false equivalency principle women rely on. Deductively, it should make sense.

For every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. Only in a mindset and a social order based on egalitarian-equalism is that reaction presumed to be the binary opposite of the original action.

All of this presumption only functions in a social order that’s based on the idea of egalitarian equalism between the sexes. When we look at things from a gender-complementarity perspective, and we accept that there are fundamental differences in the innate natures of men and women, those distractions become less effective.

Once we get that men are not co-equal agents with women, we don’t even expect that there would be an equivalent to Hypergamy in men.

The genders are different. We both have strategies for sex and life and fulfillment that are not analogous to one another. Most are adversarial to the other. Women only expect that there would be balances because they presume female experience, female goals, and female contexts are mutually held by men as best for themselves.

Only in a state of equalism, ignorant and intolerant of anything not agreed upon by “feminine correctness,” is there a presumption that men must have some parallel to the motivators and behaviors that prompt women.

Men are not women; women are not men.

Our strategies are often incompatible or, at the very least, require a degree of compromise or total abandonment in a relationship between men and women. Only women (and feminized men) default to presupposing men are their functional equals.

BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER

One annoying quirk of the Manosphere is its tendency to fixate on “pet pathologies.” It’s common to ascribe a lack of social intelligence or social retardation to **Asperger’s Syndrome** today. I’m not suggesting that Asperger’s isn’t a legitimate problem, but guys too readily attribute their social awkwardness to it. This delegitimizes the actual illness.

Average men often report discomfort in making approaches, and Game in general, because of varying degrees of social anxiety they’ve internalized for the better part of their lives. That anxiety isn’t a personality disorder; it’s just what guys go through when risking rejection.

Today it’s much simpler to attribute nervous awkwardness to a psychological disorder than to admit that they’ve got a lot of work ahead of them. Unlearning mental hindrances you’ve been conditioned to believe about yourself for so long takes time, but you don’t necessarily need a clinical psychologist to sort it out for you.

I’m not saying guys don’t have Asperger’s, but honest introspection is necessary before you diagnose it for yourself.

Another widespread neurosis that gets attributed to women in the Manosphere is BPD, ***Borderline Personality Disorder***.

The DSM-IV-TR Diagnostic Criteria

A pervasive pattern of instability of interpersonal relationships, self-image, and affects, and marked impulsivity beginning by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts, as indicated by five (or more) of the following:

- 1. Frantic efforts to avoid real or imagined abandonment.*
- 2. A pattern of unstable and intense interpersonal relationships characterized by alternating between extremes of idealization and devaluation.*
- 3. Identity disturbance: Markedly and persistently unstable self-image or sense of self.*
- 4. Impulsivity in at least two potentially self-damaging areas (e.g., spending, sex, substance abuse, reckless driving, binge eating). Note: Do not include suicidal or self-mutilating behavior covered in criterion 5.*
- 5. Recurrent suicidal behavior, gestures, threats, or self-mutilating behavior.*
- 6. Affective instability due to a marked reactivity of mood (e.g., intense episodic dysphoria, irritability, or anxiety usually lasting a few hours and only rarely more than a few days).*
- 7. Chronic feelings of emptiness.*
- 8. Inappropriate, intense anger or difficulty controlling anger (e.g., frequent displays of temper, constant anger, recurrent physical fights).*
- 9. Transient, stress-related paranoid ideation or severe dissociative symptoms.*

I struggled with deciding to include this chapter in this book. When men read the definition of BPD for the first time, they're either too eager to diagnose women with it or deny it's a *thing*. It's very convenient to ascribe these symptoms and tendencies to the "psycho bitches" that men often complain about.

Who doesn't know a woman who regularly exhibits all these symptoms? She's crazy in bed, but she's also crazy out of bed. I would doubt that a man dating in the last decade hasn't encountered one or some combination of this neurosis.

As the gender landscape evolves, so too does the variety of psychoses. For this reason, I think understanding actual BPD neurosis, compared to the everyday anxieties of women's insecurities, needs to be explored in a book about Game. You need to know what to look out for.

True BPDs

I rarely do this, but I'm going to relate a personal experience here. I had a long-term relationship with a BPD woman for about four years in my 20s. I can tell you from experience it's nothing to laugh at or take lightly. It's particularly damaging for average Blue Pill-conditioned men locked in a BPDs negative feedback loop.

It's hazardous for guys gaslighting themselves into a soul-destroying ONEitis with her and associates himself as the source of her depression and psychosis.

Faithful BPD women progressively gaslight their men to believe that **they** are the source of her neurosis. You are not yourself; you are who she's molding you to be. Eventually, you'll come to believe that it's in your best interest – indeed, your masculine responsibility – to **be who she wants you to be** to cure her neurosis.

You will gradually give up on your family and friends (or they give up on you). You will drop all ambitions and passions that directly focus on you. You will abandon any genuine, independent identity you held for yourself because these are threats to the neurotic narrative she constructs for herself and lives out.

This is the isolation phase of BPD; cut off from your old self and your old life, your identity evolves from a singular focus on her. Combined with women's innate solipsism, BPD can be a death sentence for isolated, low self-esteem, men with a scarcity mentality.

She will reward your conversion to her psychosis with intermittent crazy-hot sex you've only seen in porn. This is the reinforcer to keep you locked into her narrative. The **YOU** you were will cease to exist, and the character she creates for you will take over.

This is especially true for Beta chumps who see their BPD girlfriend as their best and only option for a long-term romantic prospect. They will readily cast her in the role of *soulmate*. She's an SMV 9 (to him), and he's never fucked better than a 5 in his whole life, so the risk of catastrophic loss is real and ever-present.

It's fate that brought them together, and if he can only help ease her fears and insecurities he's responsible for, they can live happily ever after.

In the latter stages of a BPD relationship, you will get to the point where her overt cuckolding of you is an acceptable situation. Her seeking sex outside the *relationship* is your fault because you are the source of her sickness.

You think you'll mitigate it by negotiating some "open relationship" status with her. You will rationalize that negotiating for her desire by agreeing to this is preferable to losing her. You'll propose that an open relationship means you're both free to fuck other parties when in reality, it's the only way your subconscious can accept that she's going to go fuck other guys - and you're going to accept it because you're locked into her neurosis. It's your fault she feels compelled to fuck other guys, and you'll believe it.

The mere suggestion of you being interested in sex with another woman will send her into fits of jealous, histrionic rage. You're living in fear. She'll threaten to commit suicide if you attempt to remove yourself (a classic BPD implied threat), but trust me, it'll be you who swallows a bullet long before she does. I've personally known two men who've done just this and another who hung himself due to a BPD relationship.

It will seem like the friends you still have are blowing you off by saying "get out" or moving on, but your life depends on you extracting yourself from this relationship. Cutting you off, reforming your personality, and

disengaging you from external perspectives about your twisted relationship is essential to sustaining BPD neuroses. Eventually, your friends and family will give up on the “new you.” That will be the turning point.

I must add this; when and if you finally muster the self-preservation instinct to leave her, expect a complete about-face in her mentality and behavior. The one thing a true BPD loathes more than her victim is the thought of having to trap another. There are plenty of average men ready to fill that role, but the comfort and predictability she’s curated in you for so long create an emotional dependency on you.

BPDs will fight like wild animals not to lose their victim. Expect an **extinction burst** of novel behaviors from her at this time. These panic behaviors are calculated to keep you in her reality when you attempt to leave.

For a guy so accustomed to her neurotic behavior, your first impression is that she’s making some real change for you to “improve the relationship.”

It’s not, but so radical a shift in her behavior will convince you otherwise, and cause you to doubt her deception, particularly when you have no options and believe you’ll never do any better than her.

ZEROED OUT - MEN AND SUICIDE

I've known two personal friends who've taken their own lives because their Blue Pill conditioned beliefs set them on a path to self-destruction. When I started writing, an essential part of my charter was to reach men dealing with issues in their personal, romantic, or married lives directed by what their Blue Pill acculturation molded them to be. Since then, there have been developments in my perspective on men taking their own lives due to the Blue Pill's influence on them.

Today, men are statistically between 3.5 to 5x more likely than women to kill themselves. Red Pill-aware men know this stat well. It gets quoted when women trot out their stats about abuse or whatever issue they think it is that MRAs are "confused" about. I'm always drawn to the comparative matters women think are equitable to that of men taking their own lives.

Men's disposability is nothing new to the Manosphere. Sperm is cheap, eggs are expensive, and men are expected to sacrifice their lives for the security and betterment of women even in the most Patriarchal of social orders. Issues of mandatory male conscription in the military (potential death) and the unignorable high male suicide rates are something women still won't accept as being a pretty raw deal for men.

Women's innate solipsism compels them to find some "Yeah, but..." rationalization for men's disposability. Whenever I bring something like this up, the retort is that I'm complaining about men being disposable. It's impossible to discuss male disposability without such connotations. I'm not seeking some equitable disposability for women; instead, it's about drawing attention to how women rationalize their part in that disposability.

True Powerlessness

There is an inherent power imbalance in this disposability. I've stated in the past that true power is not the control we can exert over the lives of others – it's the extent to which we have control over the direction of our own lives. When we discuss power issues between men and women, the ultimate loss of that control is in the context of our deaths.

Game Maxim #44: Men have no greater powerlessness than a lack of control over our disposability.

There's an evolved component to male psychological firmware that predisposes us to sacrifice ourselves for the security of our women and children. This is known as Kin Altruism. It's inborn impulsivity for protecting women and children that are triggered in life-threatening situations.

When an active shooter indiscriminately opens fire at a crowd of people, men, not women, instinctively put their bodies between the bullets and women or children – even ones they don't know.

Evolution takes more chances with men. By nature, men are more disposable than women. Women's hindbrains instinctively understand this, so women's psychology must find ways to reconcile men's sacrifices for them to move on in life. This psychology can manifest in ways like the **War Brides** dynamic.

However, in today's global mass media social environment, this reconciliation takes some uglier turns. The communication age has made women very efficient in consoling each other while rationalizing men's sacrifices. Since the late 1960s, feminism has defined women by two conflicting identities.

Women have historically been oppressed victims of patriarchal oppression *and* empowered superwomen with limitless potential. Modern women have the option to wear whichever identity solves or dismisses a problem more efficiently. Generally speaking, female victimization and patriarchal oppression work best in confronting men's disposability.

Men's higher suicide rate is attributed to their 'fragile male egos.' They delete themselves because a male-dominated society taught them they're worthless. Men are just victims of the social conditioning of "toxic" masculinity.

Gynocentric society dismisses male suicide rates by attributing it to men's baseless self-pity or their inability to live up to being "**real men**" according to antiquated toxic masculinity standards. This rationale reinforces popular gender memes and, at the same time, absolves women of the guilt associated with men's sacrifices.

Men are hardwired for self-sacrifice. In mythological terms, to be male **is** to sacrifice yourself. A martyr's death and a coward's death are only defined by what they died for. Evolution made women the vulnerable sex and men the disposable sex because of women's inherent vulnerability.

Throughout history, women have constantly evolved social and psychological schema to help them clear the red from their lives' ledger for men's sacrifices. It helps if women can fall back on social conventions that put the associated guilt of men's sacrifices back on the men themselves.

Chivalry and traditional masculinity are fine when they serve the Feminine Imperative, but if a man gets killed or kills himself as part of that, well, that's on him then. There will always be a need to absolve women's guilt, or complicity, in men's deaths. In terms of war and men being drafted, women default to the asinine presumption that world wars would cease if women were running.

I won't dignify that with any deeper analysis other than to say that this too is one more feeble way of looking for absolution in the sacrifices men make to facilitate women's reality.

Suicide Solution

That still leaves the question: Why do men take their own lives in such alarmingly high numbers compared to women? Research shows **7 in 10 suicides are men between the ages of 45 and 65**. The popularized reason for this is men's stereotypically masculine stubbornness in seeking psychiatric help before attempting suicide.

Again, this absolves women of any complicity and reframes any discussion about what motivates men to suicide. There's no attempt to understand the underlying reasons for male suicide, only a gender-reaffirming 'men-are-stupid' answer to avoid conversation.

There's a lot to consider when it comes to male suicide. Never in history has there ever been generations of more purposeless men. Men need a function. We are innately idealists and problem solvers. We look outward at the world and imagine what is possible. Our mental firmware predisposes us to problem solving and improvisation.

This aspect of male nature is an adaptation to women's survival need to select men who are dominant and competent. While men's physicality and prowess sexually *arouse* women, they are *attracted* to men displaying characteristics of competency, confidence, mastery, and social and creative intelligence as a selected-for survival adaptation.

This is the basis of what I call men's ***Burden of Performance***. Whether stemming from physical prowess, social dominance, or creative intelligence, our competency as men is integral to our reproductive success and overall life success.

However, at no other time in history has men's competency been devalued and debased. Only physical prowess and accommodating short-term (Alpha Fucks)

breeding imperatives of women have much value to them in an era where the Beta Bucks side of Hypergamy is uniquely satisfied by women themselves.

At no other time has the equity in what a man can provide, create, or resolve been so implicitly unneeded or superfluous to women. Consider men's superfluosity in relation to the rates of college enrollment and graduation of women compared to men. When we consider the practical problems that men used to solve, our utility has never been less needed – or at least that's today's zeitgeist.

We read about how men *must* accept this new social reality. Our purpose and function are no longer *needed* or valued, and we need to change our headspace about it as if it were something men might simply turn off.

This, again, is the result of equalist beliefs that anything gender-specific is something learned rather than innate. But we cannot simply change our minds about needing a function or applying ourselves to problems through which we find an ambition. And ambition in men is an attraction for women. We evolved to be problem solvers, **women talk, men do**, but now we are expected to accept that men are obsolete. There's nothing left for us to do, but the aspects of our *doing* natures made us attractive to women throughout history.

Loss of Utility

In my first book, I coined the term ***Relational Equity***. It describes men investing too much of their egos in what intrinsic (and extrinsic) value they believe women *should* appreciate about them. In old order thinking, this *equity* had some conditional value to women. This used to be investing oneself into the relationship solidifying aspects of provisioning, protection, competency, and parental investment.

She'll love me more/appreciate me/never cheat on me because the value I add to the relationship makes me attractive.

Today, there is very little a man might consider value-added equity (unless it's exceedingly rare or over-valued) as a hedge against Hypergamy. The equity men believe they earn by being a good husband/father material is no insurance against an openly embraced Hypergamy.

It's also no insurance against women's security and provisioning needs being met by themselves or resources that come from outside that relationship. It is vital to consider this when we look at why 45 - 65-year-old men are predisposed to higher rates of (deaths of despair) suicide, higher rates of alcoholism, and more frequent opioid abuse.

A contributing factor to male suicide rates is men's need for purpose, function, and accomplishment during this phase of life. Men in all demographics are dropping out of social involvement. In some respects, this can be attributed to men being forced out of careers, but it's primarily a generational shift away from the utility of being a man.

Despite the unprecedented connectivity we enjoy today, men don't seek out bonds with other men. This is because men need to share a common purpose to form these bonds.

It's just how we're wired. Men and women form friendships differently.

Women schedule a time to interact with their same-sex friends just to communicate. They enjoy the act of sharing. Men need function or a common purpose to come together. We need an activity, a hobby, or a problem to solve, and *then* we communicate and form friendships in the process.

Women talk; men do.

This is a well-studied fact. Our brains (and our social networks) primarily center on purpose and function. Let's presume that despite having all the information in the world at our fingertips, we remove all need for the utility that men are wired to provide, not just women but the larger scope of society. We get a generation of men on the outside looking in.

Only the most creative, resourceful, and motivated elite of men can utilize, much less master, all that this information has to offer. And even a portion of those men can see past the antipathy of their supposed obsolescence to do something meaningful or masterful. As the saying goes, most men live lives of quiet desperation, but these men are demonstrably useless in the modern era.

I mean that in a practical sense. Once the average man has been wrung out of his utility to women, he ceases to convince his hindbrain that he can build, improvise or solve things in the future. He loses his utility.

Once a man is stripped of his usefulness, once it's made clear that all of the equity he believed would support his relationship has been erased, men will still resort to practical, deductive solutions. That solution may be suicide when weighed with the prospect of having to rebuild himself in a new context. But even if he could rebuild,

would he just be building a new 'him' based on his old belief set?

When my brother-in-law committed suicide, it seemed to be the most logical end he would come to. He was a man very steeped in Blue Pill ideals, but he was also a man who prided himself on what he could **do**. And if he didn't know how to do something, he was always a fast learner.

He built his life and expectations of a future life around the relational equity he believed defined him as a man. He was very invested in an old social contract that defined a man's attractiveness, respectability, and quality in what it was he could do. What he built for himself and his wife defined his identity.

All of that 20+ years of building equity and an identity based on it was erased for him in about six months. But for 20-years, he'd been saving, building, solving, and refining for a perceived future he believed would be lived out for the rest of his life that got erased.

His suicide made perfect sense from a male-deductive logic perspective. What didn't make sense was all of the endless rationalizations I heard from family, friends, his kids, his ex/widow. It was all explanations of why they thought he went through with it when it was plain for anyone who wanted to confront the truth to see.

These rationales are the ones I read now whenever a high-profile man (Anthony Bourdain) kills himself. "If only men would reach out and get in touch with their emotions when they have suicidal thoughts." These were the same rationales that might absolve his ex of the guilt and were meant to console her, though she didn't need it.

My brother-in-law made a practical decision, not an emotional one. While I'd never say that a guy's emotional state isn't influential in his suicide, how he comes to a decision is more attributable to men's deductive nature. He showed no outward signs of emotional distress. Right up to his hanging himself, he was in excellent spirits, seemingly

accepting that the wife he lived his life for would be leaving him soon. He was very matter-of-fact in a way that men are when they've resolved something for themselves.

When a guy seems to accept a bad turn of luck and take things in stride, we don't want to create a problem where we see none. Few of us have the insight to look for a problem or the time for concern if one exists. Men are disposable anyway. Women don't want to be inconvenienced by having to console men who are hurting.

Vulnerability in men is anti-seductive. It's repulsive because it belies incompetence in a man's problem-solving ability. A vulnerable man can't be depended upon for provisioning, protection, or parental investment. So when a man isn't showing outward signs of depression, aggression, or despair, it's much easier for women to believe he's doing just fine and move on in life.

When we look at the high rate of male suicide in this context, we see how men come to this decision. Everything men have built up to 45-65 is now debased, devalued, or simply erased. Divorce is the number one precursor to suicide for men in this cohort. All of the value and equity they've committed their lives to – doing the right thing according to their Blue Pill conditioning – is as if it never mattered.

So, they're confronted with a choice; rebuild themselves (hopefully in a new Red Pill-aware paradigm), reconstruct a new life and tough it out, *or* simply, pragmatically erase themselves.

I've had at least two occasions where I've been confronted with rebuilding myself. It's a tough prospect, especially when you're Red Pill aware and understand the mechanics of having to rebuild a life from scratch after so much investment in plans and projects you truly believed in when you made them.

My father had to confront this rebuilding at 55-years-old, but rather than rebuild or kill himself, I watched him

slowly decay into a man I never knew could be my dad.

Zeroed Out

In 2018 I introduced a concept for what most men can expect at some point in their lives. This is the idea of being **Zeroed Out**.

Basically, at some point in your life, you'll face having hard-earned status, financial equity, reputation, professional and educational growth, emotional investment, and other metrics in your life's equity being erased. Since then, I've seen much of this concept misconstrued for men.

I think it ought to be part of any Red Pill-aware man's understanding that we will be confronted with the prospects of having to rebuild ourselves at many points in our lives. Failure, rejection, and disappointment will happen for you; that's just part of a man's life. It's easy to rattle off platitudes about how many times you get back up being the measure of a man. But what I'm saying is there will be times when total reconstruction of your life will be a necessity.

You will be Zeroed Out at some point. How you handle being Zeroed Out is a much different situation than a temporary setback. This is a catastrophic loss that men of the past four generations haven't been taught to deal with. This is zeroing out is made all the more difficult when you confront the fact that what you believed to be so valuable, the equity you were told was what others would measure you by, was all part of a false narrative, your Blue Pill conditioning. It's not just the loss of a job, a home, a wife, or kids; it's the loss of belief in a plan you thought would carry you through the rest of your days on earth.

You need to understand that there is most definitely hope for a better remake of yourself based on truths learned in the hardest way.

It's easy to think this is male victimhood or a guy is complaining about his lot in life. Empathy, especially amongst men, has always been in short supply. I've learned the hard way never to bring up how sick I am, how bad my job was, or how little sleep I got the night before in the company of three or more men - because I guarantee you that one has cancer, the other works in raw sewage and the last one's an incurable insomniac.

Conventional masculinity has always been about sacrifice. It's about how well we accept and adapt to adversity, so just mentioning a guy being **Zeroed Out** at some stage in his life sounds like I'm complaining, "Men have it so tough." We're supposed to take it on the chin and come back for more.

Guys even get competitive about how hard they've had it and how well they adapted to a bad situation. Others just don't want to hear about another guy's misfortunes. And others will say that men are living their lives wrong if he bases his sense of self on the opinions of others - and women in particular.

The first two are simple to address. Men are in a general state of competition with each other, even if this is only ever recognized as something going on in the social background. It doesn't necessarily have to be vicious competition; even friendly, healthy rivalries are still rivalries. Men can be sympathetic depending on circumstance, but that competitive nature is still something winners and losers instinctually understand.

Out-group men will understand this state more distinctly than in-group men (kin affiliation is an evolved survival adaptation). Even within that in-group, there will still exist

male dominance hierarchies. How those hierarchies are established is contextual to societal and environmental influences. However, ***that*** they exist is something feminine-primary society would like men to sweep under the carpet themselves.

Qualifying Value

Competition is one thing; however, the idea that a man might base his life's expectations and measure success or failure on external qualifiers is something that needs explanation. Social influences, family influences, and men's understanding of intersexual dynamics by what he perceives is expected of him is a point of contention. If men feel Zeroed Out at various points in life, is that 'zeroing' just the effect of a man having built his integrity and equity on a foundation of Blue Pill sand?

This is a primary tenet of *Men Going Their Own Way*. It rejects women's qualifying men's worth based on their Hypergamous standards. I get that. I argue that there's more to a man's sense of self-worth than any qualifier womankind might place on him.

Red Pill-aware men need to understand the game that they're part of. This includes reestimating their worth after cutting away their prior Blue Pill ideals. Every man who unplugs himself from his old ideals is ***going his own way***, but where he decides to **go** and how he creates value in himself in this new paradigm is what's at issue.

In developing and building a new sense of self-worth, there is still the potential for men to lose value irrespective of how they believe it ***should*** be measured. In other words, MGTOW get Zeroed Out too.

A divorced man, '*woke*' and living by his terms, losing custody and influence in the lives of his children, can be a zeroing out for him. Positivity hustlers will tell you never to compare yourself to others; compare yourself to who you were yesterday.

That might sell courses online, but there are aspects of what we hold as our worth that **can** be zeroed out no matter what metric we think we should evaluate ourselves.

A woman should only ever be a complement to a man's life, never its focus. Despite this, we still have intrinsic value that can be erased, and it doesn't alter the fact that women, family, career peers, etc., will be affected by it. It's an easy cop-out to say, *"Well, what you thought should be valued by others isn't, and because you thought it was, when you lose it, you lose everything."*

III. You shall make your mission, not your woman, your priority

*Forget all those romantic cliches of the leading man proclaiming his undying love for the woman who completes him. Despite whatever protestations to the contrary, women do not want to be "The One" or the center of a man's existence. They want to subordinate themselves to a worthy man's life purpose, help him achieve that purpose with their feminine support, and follow the path he lays out. You must respect a woman's integrity and not lie to her that she is "your everything." **She is not your everything, and if she is, she will soon not be anymore.***

This is the third commandment from ***Roissy's 16 Commandments of Poon***. It's relevant here because it illustrates how average men think about the metrics they build their equity on. It's easy to get upset at plugged-in men who are blind to the simplest of Red Pill principles.

It's easy to lose sight that average men are still Blue Pill. They will fight you just for suggesting they're wrong about the reality they find themselves in. Even if they fail to see it will potentially be their undoing.

More importantly, we need to remember that men's suicide rates are predicated on men who built their value on what their Blue Pill conditioning embedded in them. That's what we're up against. This attrition rate will

continue until more men come to Red Pill awareness. This is what we're faced with as Red Pill-aware men trying to help other guys unplug.

Game Maxim #45: *Game is not just about how a guy can get laid — it might be about saving his life.*

My brother-in-law killed himself because he was convinced that sacrificing every ambition he had and 'doing the right thing' would be appreciated, respected, and rewarded. The Blue Pill quite literally killed him. He was convinced that he couldn't live without his *soulmate*, whom he'd made "his everything."

Remove that *everything*, and he ceased to exist. He literally *couldn't* live without her.

Tragically, his was only one story that mirrors the stories of countless more men. We live in a dangerous age for men. Blue Pill idealism is evolving to be even more of a liability today than it was in the time of the seduction community. We live in an era that encourages men to either go all-in with their life's investment in that conditioning or go all-in with a condemned, *Black Pill Doomer* nihilism. Both of these options lead to being Zeroed Out.

Men building their sense of self-worth on this false ideology is obvious. Yes, we should make ourselves our ***Mental Point of Origin***. More importantly, we should realize that our lives depend on **Killing the inner Beta** and discarding the idealistic hope that old order standards measure our equity is vital to our survival.

I get pissed off at Purple Pill "life coaches" because this is the dangerous value system they can never let go of and encourage other men to readopt.

Men *will* find themselves **Zeroed Out** in their lives. Guys still mired in an old order belief set, convinced that it's the only legitimate way of valuing himself, are

positioned to become a suicide statistic. The real tragedy is this false evaluation leads most men to suicide while he hears “**atta’ boys**” and positive thinking mantras from men who don’t know what else to say.

I apologize. This topic is a bit of a downer for a book on Game. However, understanding how men get Zeroed Out must be part of Red Pill awareness. At many points in your life, you can expect to be confronted with the prospects of having to rebuild yourself. Failure, rejection, and disappointment will happen for you; that’s just part of a man’s life.

To end this, I will quote the comment of a man I met at a convention I spoke at. I won’t use his name, but he confessed that he was a frequent commenter on my blog after we talked. He’d made the trip to the convention to meet me face to face, to thank me for my work, and kindly permitted me to use his words. I won’t quote it entirely, but his situation is an example of, and an inspiration for, everything I’ve put forth in this chapter:

“After a long marriage, I divorced the mother of my children. A couple of years later, after some casual dating, I met a woman I would come to describe as my soulmate. I got married young - but this time, with all my infinite wisdom gained over the years - I was finally wise enough to pick a woman I was super compatible with.

We were together for a few years and even lived together. Things started great, and it was mostly smooth sailing until we moved in together - at which time I slowly allowed myself to become Beta in a slow-motion, excruciatingly painful way.

About a month after breaking up with her, I fully planned to commit suicide. I wrote a long letter explaining my rationalization and took other steps

towards going through with it. About a week after I wrote a note – with Death Day fast approaching – I took a break from getting my affairs to surf the net. I stumbled upon an Ask Reddit thread that was bad-mouthing various subreddits. Some feminazi or male feminists mentioned the Red Pill subreddit as an example of a subreddit filled with craziness, and I decided to check what all of the fuss was about.

I'm not a religious man, but I will never rule out divine intervention. The timing of finding The Red Pill – by complete coincidence no less – couldn't have been more fortuitous. I stayed up all night reading the sidebar – Rollo's essays having the most profound effect on me – and everything...just...clicked....Talk about connecting the dots! Wow! It was very much like a come to Jesus moment. It was like divinity revealed secret knowledge to me just when I needed it – knowledge that gave me hope and may have saved my life. This all went down not that long ago in actual time – but from where I metaphorically stand now, it seems like an eternity. I canceled my Death Day, and my kids still have a father in their lives because of this work."

Stay strong, my friend. You can rebuild yourself even in the face of being hopelessly Zeroed Out.

THE REAL YOU

Here we are at the end of your Game journey. You likely still have a lot of questions. You'll probably wonder who you really are now that you have a grasp of the game you're in. Authentic identity is a hard thing to consider once you unplug. Dealing with this question depends on your strengths in dealing with transitions.

“How do I switch from being a Beta loser to an Alpha winner?”

There's always a lot involved with how a guy can transition from one state to another. To today's generation of low-value average men, you must be selling snake oil if you don't have an immediate solution for their most pressing problem. Average men want a magic formula. They want a mantra to repeat, steps to follow, or a secret hack that will miraculously shift them from Beta virgin into Alpha cad. This is what all the best online hustlers promise.

Well, maybe not “Cad.” Most guys still cling to their Blue Pill hopes. They only see what the Red Pill presents as a key to getting to the Dream Girl the Blue Pill promised them but never delivered.

As I've pointed out countless times, average men's only *real* problem is finding the one special girl that ideally fits their one-sided sexual strategy. Average men expect the old social contract of monogamy should be his default setting - even if he's a high SMV man and Game would serve his interests best.

Real change takes time

I know that sounds cliché, but part of that change always involves reassessing your life during the process. And that's always hard for the *Too Long; Didn't Read* (TL;DR) generation. ***Ain't nobody got time for that.*** A daunting aspect of unplugging a guy from the Matrix is that the goals you had while you were Blue Pill and "plugged in" tend to fall away once you shift to a Red Pill-aware mentality.

The "girl of your dreams" loses her veneer of desirability. The previous goals defined for you by Blue Pill ideals are no longer the ends you wished to achieve when you started this transformation. This is sometimes the most challenging aspect of "awakening" for guys to accept. Anger at yourself for wasting so much time and potential in not grasping the truth sooner is part of that process.

So too is a sense of helplessness, if not hopelessness, that accompanies the realization that you might not have what it takes (at the moment) to achieve what you want in life in this Red Pill paradigm.

Game Maxim #46: *The Red Pill doesn't exist so you will hate women; it exists so you won't hate women for what they can never be to you.*

There was a time in my 20s when I first began playing in the Hollywood metal scene of the late 80s that I had one such transformation. By the time I was 20, I'd already been put through the wringer by a cheating ex-girlfriend from high school – who I was sure would eventually be my wife.

I was Beta in the extreme. I was thoroughly Blue Pill conditioned, but I was going through the "*Break Phase*" in the timeline I created in my second book, ***Preventive***

Medicine. It took me about a year to shift from that mental state to one of making myself my ***Mental Point of Origin***.

Once I had - and once I'd decided I wanted to experience sex with hotter women - I found, through trial and error, I could determine what my personality would be and what was going to be acceptable or not to that new guy. I'd been emancipated from the expectations of being a Nice Guy. A kind of Game began to develop for me in essentially not caring what I was supposed to be doing to appease women. I changed things up and figured out what worked for me.

I finally got into a "real band" at 21. I played clubs every Friday or Saturday night between the ages of 21 and 25. Honestly, I only left my dad's home because it was inconvenient for banging various girls I'd meet at a club on the weekend. But with that new identity came new access to sex with the women I could only fantasize about in a Hustler or a Penthouse magazine.

A pivotal point came when one of my girlfriends (I had a rotation of about 4 - 5) was a bonafide swimsuit model. I thought I had finally "arrived" at that point. My head was still measuring "success" with women by what the 15-year-old version of myself thought was "**it**." She was hotter and more fun in bed than any girl I'd previously had.

However, my mindset was still mired in my Blue Pill ideals. According to those ideals, she **was** the goal. And she really was, until I managed to pull a Playboy centerfold who happened to live near me in North Hollywood.

Humblebrag, yeah, but the point I'm making is that part of changing yourself involves unlearning the conditioning that taught you what success means. It wasn't just that I'd made myself my *Mental Point of Origin*; I wanted to make the most of that time of my life. It wasn't "validation seeking" or "filling a hole in my heart" or any other rationalization you read from mediocre minds. I just wanted to get laid, and I enjoyed it.

But, to do so, meant that **I needed to change my mind about who I wanted to be**. I had to transition from one personality to another, and honestly, I liked it. I was rewarded with women's genuine sexual desire, which further reinforced that new **me** as the **authentic me**. This begs the question; what is *authenticity* when it comes to "just being yourself?"

Later in my twenties, I chose to involve myself with a clinically psychologically imbalanced woman (BPD). Guys who read my BPD story always think they would've known better, but she never wore a t-shirt with "**I'm insane**" written across it. I trapped myself in her neurosis over almost four years.

You already read the details about this relationship in *Borderline Personality Disorder*, but one thing I don't get into in that chapter is how I willingly became someone else. I fundamentally changed my personality again to solve this girl's problems because I believed that who **I** was when we met was so flawed it was causing her neurosis.

I wanted to change my personality to solve her problems. I didn't understand what I involved myself in, but my point is that who I was had shifted, but my core, internalized belief set was still very much informed by my Blue Pill conditioning.

People who ride hard on the *Personal Responsibility* belief love to think that someone so damaging must be self-apparent. No one's ever really a victim because they should've seen it coming - as they believe they would. But, the reality is we *want* to think that the ideals we've been raised on can come true. We want to believe that the dreams we internalized at five years old on into adulthood are a possibility.

In all my writing, I make a case for a need to unplug oneself from the *Matrix* that is this Blue Pill conditioning. Red Pill awareness is an awareness of a false existence we used to live out according to what others would like us to

believe is true because they want it to be true for themselves.

When I allowed myself to change my personality for my BPD girlfriend, I had no idea I was doing so because I wanted to believe she represented the ideal that the Blue Pill raised me to think would be possible. A woman who fucked like a pornstar, looked like a swimsuit model, and “loved me as much as I loved her” was a dream come true. And this came after I’d already checked “*swimsuit model*” and a “*centerfold*” off of my to-fuck list.

Personality is malleable. It’s so malleable we often don’t realize we’re forging a new one. In both of these instances, that shift in nature was not by my conscious choice. I knew what I wanted to do. Enjoying multiple women in the Hollywood scene of the early 90s meant I had to become someone else.

In the worst-case scenario with my BPD, the shift was prompted because I thought if I changed my personality, her psychosis would resolve itself. My Blue Pill conditioning exacerbated this because it continuously teaches men that any problem a woman has with a guy is due to his lack of investment or not giving enough of themselves.

Beneath all this was my Blue Pill subroutine manifesting itself. Even when I was on top of my game in the Hollywood clubs, I still wanted to find a “**good girl**” to be my girlfriend. I changed my personality to succeed in getting what I wanted, but my root programming was still Blue Pill. Many a famous PUA gets to the problem of trying to make his Blue Pill romantic dreams come true because he learned how to reliably ‘get the girl.’

Game Maxim #47: *Game savvy doesn’t necessarily make a man Red Pill aware.*

It's undoubtedly the gateway to understanding women's nature and the nature of intersexual dynamics, but *killing the Beta* is a long-term project.

So how do you shift from Average Guy to Player? Alpha and Beta are now euphemisms usually meant to disparage the whole idea of changing yourself into something better. Most people don't have the insight to think they'd ever need to change their nature. It's easier to trot out "*Just be yourself*" when someone has that introspection.

People don't want you to change.

Your predictability gives them comfort. You're easier to deal with. They think you're not being authentic if you act in some new way. You're a *wannabe*, a poseur, and they need you to behave predictably because it gives them a sense of control over you. Others want to pigeonhole you.

They want to categorize you into immutable personality types with cryptic letters or astrological signs that make them feel better about dealing with someone like you. If they can categorize you and make you believe they know the truth of it, you're just that much easier to control. Humans need to see patterns in their environment. The world is chaotic, so it's natural to think we can set some willful order to it.

Eventually, after I'd finally torn myself away from my BPD girlfriend, I returned to that Alpha personality that had been so successful for me. This time, I finally realized that I needed to make myself my *Mental Point of Origin*. When I look back on all the women I'd applied the Blue Pill set of rules, ideals, hopes, and dreams to, I shake my head. I was 26 and had nothing to show for all the great potential people kept telling me I had.

I did everything according to the old set of books. I was supportive, kind, sensitive, generous, uplifting, and empowering to every woman I'd been in a relationship with. I was taught that these personality traits would make

me desirable. As I looked back on all of that, I realized I had done so at my expense – at the cost of my potential.

Know this now:

Sacrificing your potential will always lead a man to his destruction.

I thank God it didn't lead to my own.

At this point in my life, I realized I had to unfuck my life. That meant a radical reimagining of who I wanted to be going forward. I'm often asked how I became unplugged, and my usual answer is that it was a gradual process. This is true, but it was at this point I had to reject all the lies and romantic fantasies that I'd been raised to believe in, to invest my ego in.

You will never achieve Blue Pill ideals with Red Pill awareness.

Unplugging, killing the Beta, reinventing who you are is not only possible for you, but it's necessary to sustain you in a life of your imagining. This doesn't happen just by reading this book or going to a seminar. Ultimately you have to live it and internalize that new you. You **have** to do this despite *friends* who want you to be "authentic" and stay the old you so you'll be comfortable with them.

All of this takes time, persistence, and introspection, but it starts with an act of will on your part. You will only get what you have gotten if you keep doing what you have done. I can teach you Game. I can teach you the habits and mannerisms that would make others believe you're a self-sufficient Alpha success. But only you can change your authentic personality. Theory and practice can only take you so far.

Game Maxim #48: *At some point, you have to BE the Game.*

It has to become second nature. Game has to **be** the *authentic* personality you choose it be rather than an act you perform that covers the incongruence of the *old* you. This is the *real* inner Game, not some imaginary *higher-meaning* state that positivity gurus sell courses on self-talk, inner healing, and self-hypnosis to achieve. *Being* the Game is organic. The authentic personality you **choose** is the natural extension of Red Pill awareness and Game savvy.

I've been interviewed on dozens of podcasts where the host tries to get me with the same gotcha question: "Doesn't your wife know all your Red Pill tricks? How do you keep up the act of Gaming her all these years?" My answer is always the same. I don't have to Game my wife because **I am the Game**.

The Red Pill isn't a bag of tricks, and Game isn't a set of *if-then* responses a Player has to commit to memory. Game **is** my personality. Red Pill awareness **is** the lens I see things through. These podcast hosts can't grok that Game, and Red Pill awareness isn't something you turn off when the interview is over. They want you to *break character* for them because they want to know it's all an act for you.

Because if it's not an act for you, they might have to confront the challenges your authentic personality poses to their own.

Average guys lose the trail when living in Red Pill awareness. They read my books, they open their eyes, but they don't know what to **do** with the information. It's overwhelming.

My friend *Rich Cooper* once told me that reading *The Rational Male* was like drinking from a firehose. It's not just one Red Pill; it's a constant flood of contentious information. It's a lot to swallow all at once. It's tough to take in all of what that information shows you, convicts of you of, and how it fits into the way you've lived your life up to this point. What do you do with all of it?

They say knowing is half the battle, but the other half is action. The other half is implementing that knowledge to your advantage and leveraging it best to your strengths and ambitions.

I've always (jokingly) referred to myself as a *Lesser Alpha*. People think that's self-deprecating. Others think I'm just a married Beta with delusions of Alpha. "*Lesser Alpha*" was actually a designation I got from *Roissy's* old blog after taking a tongue-in-cheek Game assessment survey. Whatever.

Either way, I'm a guy who took this knowledge and applied it to serve my own best interests and forge an authentic personality based on what I understand of what we call the Red Pill. I created *myself* of my own volition based on a realistic understanding of intersexual dynamics and a better understanding of myself in that Red Pill paradigm as a result of it.

I'm probably not much different from you. I don't have some made-up rags to riches *bootstraps* story to fluff up the introductions of my books. I didn't overcome an abusive past or beat some incurable disease.

I didn't skyrocket to riches, fame, and sex with centerfolds using a secret mindset hack. I just internalized the nuts and bolts of Red Pill awareness and leveraged it to be who I wanted to be. It's really not that difficult. I just changed my mind about myself.

That's the real positive message of the Red Pill and Game. You have so much more personal potential in a Red Pill-aware paradigm. **Your eyes will hurt when you come out of the Matrix, but only because you've never used them before.**

Once they start working, your innate idealism will kick in once the Game **is** you. You'll see opportunities and possibilities your old way of thinking prevented you from ever knowing existed. Then you'll realize what to **do**. And

those realizations make for some **very exciting times my friend**.

So, who is the **real** you? Who decides what **your** real personality is and what is authentic for you? What is the estimate that your character is based on? Who gets to change your mind? I am sick of hearing women and men talk about *finding* themselves. Women love the idea of a journey of self-discovery.

This is a fantasy idealism meant to keep them in helplessness and hypoagency. The world **acts upon them** rather than **them acting on the world**. Women use this garbage as a convenient rationale to excuse bad decisions they made with inaccurate information.

Game Maxim #49: *Red Pill men don't find themselves; they build themselves.*

They forge themselves into a creation of their choosing based on realistic assessments of themselves, their conditions, and the world that challenges them not to build anything of themselves. The Red Pill offers you tools, not therapy.

The art of Game gives you brushes and paint, but you are the blank canvass, not a cheap paint-by-numbers project. I wrote this book to educate you and encourage you and be honest with you – **this building takes time**, and you will meet all manner of resistance to the masculine project that is you. **You are the artist, architect, and builder of you.**

Now I want to see what **you** create with these tools.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Sometimes called the *Godfather of the Red Pill*, **Rollo Tomassi** has been a permanent fixture in the online men's consortium of the *Manosphere* for almost 20 years. He is the author of the internationally best-selling book series, *The Rational Male*.

Rollo is also the essayist/blogger/owner of The Rational Male blog (therationalmale.com), a weekly panelist/host of the *Rule Zero* Livestream, and his own YouTube channel, *The Rational Male*.

Rollo lives with his wife of 25 years in Reno, Nevada, along with two (or more) greyhounds.



ALSO BY ROLLO TOMASSI

The Rational Male

The Rational Male - Preventive Medicine

The Rational Male - Positive Masculinity

The Rational Male - Religion